

THE LIBRARY QUARTERLY

VOL. III

CONTENTS FOR JULY 1933

No. 3

THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL AND THE PRESERVATION OF SOURCE MATERIALS -	AUGUSTUS FREDERICK KUHLMAN	229
THE LIBRARY SERVICE IN GREAT BRITAIN: EFFECTS OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS - - - - -	J. M. MITCHELL	248
SELECTING APPLICANTS TO A LIBRARY SCHOOL OR TRAINING CLASS: AN APPROACH TO A TECHNIQUE -	CHARLES K. A. WANG	253
GRADUATE THESES ACCEPTED BY LIBRARY SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES FROM JUNE, 1928, TO JUNE, 1932	DOUGLAS WAPLES	267
PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS FOR LIBRARY BRANCHES IN RELATION TO CIRCULATION - - - - -	CLARA W. HERBERT	292
THE CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE - - - - -		305
THE COVER DESIGN - - - - -	EDWIN ELIOTT WILLOUGHBY	306
REVIEWS		
<i>Edith Kathleen Jones, et al., The Prison library handbook</i>	MIRIAM DOWNING TOMPKINS	307
<i>Levering Tyson (ed.), Radio and education 1932: proceedings of the second annual assembly of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, Inc., 1932</i> - - - - -	F. H. LUMLEY	308
<i>Olga Pinto, Repertori bibliografici nazionali</i> -	HENRY BARTLETT VAN HOESEN	309
<i>Recent social trends in the United States: report of the President's Research Committee on Social Trends</i> - - - - -	DOUGLAS WAPLES	310
<i>M. Llewellyn Raney, The University libraries</i>	SYDNEY B. MITCHELL, F. L. D. GOODRICH, and DEAN P. LOCKWOOD	313
<i>Karl Bömer, Internationale Bibliographie des Zeitungswesens</i>	HARRY M. LYDENBERG	318
<i>William Watts Folwell, William Watts Folwell: the autobiography and letters of a pioneer of culture</i> - - - - -	J. C. M. HANSON	321

[Contents continued on following page]

<i>Norvegica: 1. Januar 1883-1933: Minneskrift til Femti-Årsdagen for Oprettelsen av Universitets Bibliotekets Norske Avdeling</i>	- - -	J. C. M. HANSON	322
<i>Philobiblon: Zeitschrift für Bücherliebhaber</i>	- - -	PIERCE BUTLER	325
B. L. Ullman, <i>Ancient writing and its influence</i>		HENRY BARTLETT VAN HOESEN	326
<i>50 Jahre Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen. Erstes Heft des Jubiläumsjahrganges. 1933</i>	- - -	J. C. M. HANSON	328
B. Lamar Johnson, <i>The Secondary-school library</i>	- - -	DOROTHA DAWSON	330
John K. Potter, <i>Samuel L. Clemens; first editions and values</i>		GERTRUDE LOOP WOODWARD	331
Inez Bowler, <i>An Elementary manual of dental library practice</i>		MADELENE MARSHALL	332
Elsa Peverly Kimball, <i>Sociology and education: An analysis of the theories of Spencer and Ward</i>	- - -	T. V. SMITH	335
BOOKS RECEIVED	- - -		336

322
325
326
328
LIBRARY QUARTERLY

330
331
332
333
Volume III

JULY 1933

Number 3

334
335
336
THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL
AND THE PRESERVATION OF
SOURCE MATERIALS

I. SITUATION OUT OF WHICH THE COUNCIL GREW

THE objectives of a research library may be said to be twofold. From one point of view, it is an end in itself. Its object as a depository is to acquire, organize, and preserve *all* of the material of merit within those fields of human knowledge and activity that fall within its defined scope. The aim is to be a treasure house which in its acquisitions has kept abreast of the progress of those sciences with which it is concerned, or has even anticipated coming trends. It stands ready to offer the scholar unexplored materials with which he can make new discoveries and extend the bounds of knowledge. From another point of view, however, the research library is a means and not an end. Its function is one of mediation between the scholar's research goals and the sources that must be discovered, acquired, and placed at his disposal under favorable working conditions if he is to be effective. To serve either of these functions well, particularly the latter, presupposes active teamwork between scholars and librarians, for the building of collections represents the product of constantly integrating sources that are to be acquired and preserved with the changing and evolving research objectives and goals of scholars. It is this interaction and interdependence between scholars and librarians

that makes the existence of the Social Science Research Council so significant for librarians who are concerned with the building of social science source collections. Though this council is but a decade old, something concerning its significance, especially for American research libraries of the future, may be learned from a study (1) of the "situation" surrounding the social science disciplines out of which it grew, (2) of the objectives which it has projected as it has evolved, and (3) of the research activities already launched or completed, that will have a far-reaching influence upon the building of competent research collections in the social sciences.

The conditions that prevailed in the social sciences in America, before the Social Science Research Council came on the scene, can be reconstructed from the report of the Committee on Political Research of the American Political Science Association. This committee was appointed at the winter meeting of the Association in 1921, with Charles E. Merriam as chairman, to study the scope and methods of research in the field of government and to offer constructive suggestions.¹ The appointment of this committee marks the beginning of the Social Science Research Council. The report of the committee at the December meeting in 1922 is highly illuminating. While it concerned itself largely with conditions pertaining to political science, nevertheless the findings and recommendations were almost equally potent for the other social sciences. This report² disclosed among other things:

1. That appreciable progress had been made in recent years in the development of a more scientific and inductive methodology in certain of the social sciences which might be of great value to other related social sciences.
2. That there was overspecialization, too complete departmentalization and isolation of the special social sciences.
3. That there was no effective medium to insure co-operative and co-ordinated research in the social sciences.
4. That the research efforts of some of the most competent men in political science were frequently crippled and thwarted because of lack of equipment, lack of leisure, and heavy teaching loads in our colleges and universities.

¹ *American political science review*, XVII (1923), 274.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 274-312.

5. That a sounder empirical method of research had to be achieved in political science if it were to assist in the development of a scientific political control.

As one of its major recommendations, the committee urged the establishment of a Social Science Research Council consisting of representatives of economics, sociology, political science, and history. The purposes of such a council were to be: (1) the development of social science research; (2) the establishment of a central clearing house for such research; (3) the establishment of institutes for social science study, with funds for research and publication; (4) the advancement of suggestions to governmental authorities regarding the statistics collected in the fields of the social sciences; (5) the improvement of the teaching of social science; and (6) any other ways and means of encouraging the development of the scientific study of politics. Further, the committee urged that every effort be made to bring about closer working relationships between students of politics and the other branches of the social sciences, and also with the students of psychology, anthropology, geography, the biological sciences, and engineering to the end that the new political science might avail itself of all of the results of modern thought in the attempt to work out scientific methods of political control.

To further the establishment of a Social Science Research Council, Mr. Merriam submitted the proposal to form such a council to the American Sociological Society and the American Economic Association at their December meetings in 1922. The sociologists approved the recommendation immediately, and voted to participate in the movement, and the economists joined in the effort early in 1923.

A second factor that stimulated the development of the Social Science Research Council was the precedent set in the physical sciences by the National Research Council. This precedent not only provided a model, but the National Research Council was grappling with an "inter-discipline" research project in its "Studies of human migration," on which it invited the assistance of social scientists. This request was presented at the preliminary meeting held in Chicago in 1923 for the purpose of

considering the organization of a Social Science Research Council.

Another "inter-discipline research problem" that gave an impetus to the formation of the Social Science Research Council dated back to the American Sociological Society's meeting in December, 1919, at which F. Stuart Chapin proposed that a joint committee, representing the social science associations, investigate and report upon a plan to provide abstracts in the social sciences corresponding to *Chemical abstracts* and *Science abstracts*.³ This project was sponsored by the American Sociological Society, and a progress report was made by Mr. Chapin at the initial meeting that was called on February 24, 1923, by Mr. Merriam to consider the organization of a research council in the social sciences.

At this meeting political science, economics, and sociology were represented. On May 17, 1923, representatives of these three social science associations met formally in Chicago and organized the Social Science Research Council with Mr. Merriam as president. The council was incorporated in December, 1924, with these three member organizations and the American Statistical Association as a fourth. In 1925 the American Psychological Association, the American Anthropological Association, and the American Historical Association were added. Each of these organizations has three representatives on the council. Since these seven societies, which constitute the council, do not cover the whole field of the social sciences, in 1929 and 1930 the council took action to appoint six members-at-large. These represent related disciplines—psychiatry, law, public health, geography, and education.

II. THE EVOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL'S OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the council as an integrating agency are suggested by its organization in representing the seven major social sciences and five closely allied disciplines in the United States. The original purpose, as stated in 1923, was that "of

³ *Publications of the American Sociological Society*, XIV (1919), 269.

promoting and co-ordinating research and furthering the development of research methods in the social studies."⁴

As the work of the council has grown, its purposes have been enlarged and have become clarified. Thus, they have developed experimentally. They were set forth as follows by its chairman, Mr. Merriam, in 1925-26:

To bring together scattered or isolated workers upon similar social problems; to avoid needless duplication of efforts; to foster the co-operation of research workers; to stimulate and encourage research in important fields not now covered; to emphasize the development of increasingly scientific methods of inquiry in social studies; occasionally to undertake research directly through its own committees; to aid in the process of developing scientific social control and where that is not possible more intelligent and constructive theory about the processes involved in social relations.⁵

The attitude of the council toward its purposes was further illustrated in the statement of the council's chairman, Wesley C. Mitchell, in 1926-27:

From the outset, the Council has sought to keep flexible its own conception of its scope and its scheme of organization. Broadly stated, its aims are two-fold: to encourage carefully planned research by co-operating workers in the several social sciences, and to serve as an informal general staff studying the larger possibilities of scientific methods applied to the understanding of man and his institutions.⁶

During the first half decade of its existence the council devoted itself largely to: (1) the study of the scientific method as applied to the social sciences; (2) the sifting, developing, and financing of research projects, many of which concerned "inter-discipline problems"; (3) the co-ordination of existing research programs through conferences and planning of the council's staff; (4) making small grants in aid to bring to completion promising pieces of research for which funds were otherwise not available; (5) the development of research personnel through fellowships; and (6) additional special activities such as the development of *Social science abstracts*.⁷

⁴ *Pub. Amer. Sociol. Soc.*, XIX (1925), 219.

⁵ *Social Science Research Council. Annual report*, 1926, p. 2.

⁶ *Ann. report*, 1926-27, p. 16.

⁷ See annual reports for the years 1926 through 1928-29.

At the time of the Hanover conference in August, 1929, the conviction had developed that the council should redefine its objectives.

There was general agreement as to the desirability of viewing the facilitation of social research more widely; it was in fact felt that, while still keeping concrete research central, the Council might through a variety of activities actually do more to stimulate effective investigations through a program of planning and co-ordination including many supplementary, supporting aspects of the general problem of social research than if it confined itself more exclusively to planning and financing a series of investigations.⁸

Under the chairmanship of William F. Ogburn, the following statement of enlarged and clarified purposes and of specific programs of action was formulated:⁹

The ultimate aim of the social sciences is to contribute to a more adequate understanding, and thus to make possible a more intelligent functioning, of the society in which we live. The Social Science Research Council is accordingly interested in promoting the extension of knowledge, by all feasible means and methods in regard to social behavior and institutions. In pursuance of this object the Council seeks to further co-operation among the several disciplines in every appropriate way.

A consideration of the existing research situation in the social sciences in the United States has suggested the following major methods by which the Council may best promote its ultimate objectives.

- I. By improvement of research organization.
- II. By development of personnel.
- III. By enlargement, improvement, and preservation of materials.
- IV. By improvement of research methods.
- V. By facilitation of the dissemination of materials, methods, and results of investigations.
- VI. By facilitation of research projects.
- VII. By enhancement of the general appreciation of the significance of the social sciences.

III. ENLARGEMENT, IMPROVEMENT, AND PRESERVATION OF MATERIALS

To make each of these seven objectives concrete and specific, a detailed set of activities was suggested,¹⁰ but limitation of space and the object of this paper necessitate that the detail of

⁸ *Ann. report, 1928-29*, p. 2.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 42.

¹⁰ *Ann. report, 1928-29*, pp. 42-48.

only the council's statement of activities pertaining to Objective III be given here.¹¹

Since scientific progress in all fields is conditioned by the existence of a constantly enlarging body of research materials and by its availability to investigators, one of the primary duties of the Council is to promote such objects and to concern itself with the improvement and preservation of research data. In carrying out these purposes the following courses of action are appropriate:

- A. Initiating and participating in plans for making more comparable and more widely serviceable the classifications of social and economic data, for making more precise the significance of the data, and for otherwise improving such records;
- B. Helping to lay out a plan for the nation-wide development and co-ordination of existing archival collections and for the building up of new research collections along special lines at strategic scholarly and geographical centers;
- C. Initiating and participating in plans for constructing union finding lists and calendars of the resources of existing research libraries, with particular reference to their social data, so as to make them more available to scholars;
- D. Initiating and participating in plans to discover, select, edit, publish, or otherwise reproduce basic data in the social sciences, which are difficult of access to students or likely to perish;
- E. Calling to the attention of individuals and of governmental, business and other institutions and agencies the importance of preserving their records for future analysis and study;
- F. Encouraging the adoption and widespread use of those varieties of paper and other materials used in the making of records, which promise a maximum durability;
- G. Initiating, encouraging, and participating in plans to develop the research uses of historical, industrial, and social museums; and encouraging the building up of new collections with these purposes in mind.

This statement of objectives was not intended as a final definition, but rather as the "next step"; however, it is so comprehensive that it may hold good for some time. It reflects an appreciation of the lack of basic data and of adequate sources—a condition not well appreciated in many of the social science disciplines until brought to light in the researches sponsored by the council.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 44-45.

IV. DIRECT APPROACHES TO THE PROBLEMS OF PRESERVING SOURCES

Since Objective III of *enlarging, improving, and preserving research materials* was projected in 1929, the council has had three committees that have concerned themselves with one or more aspects of this objective: first, the Joint Committee on Materials for Research set up with the assistance of the American Council of Learned Societies; second, a Committee on Social Statistics; and third, a Committee on Public Administration.

Among other activities the Joint Committee on Materials for Research has concerned itself with: (1) A survey of activities of American agencies, such as collecting, organizing, preserving, indexing, cataloguing, and publishing of research materials. This was done with the hope of bringing to light unnecessary omissions or duplications as well as discovering what was being done to provide material for research. This survey was carried on by Franklin F. Holbrook under the supervision of Solon J. Buck, the former chairman of the committee. A report was published early in 1932.¹² (2) Robert C. Binkley, the present chairman of the committee, has made a study of the methods and equipment for reproducing research materials by photographic processes. Upon this subject a preliminary report was also issued late in 1931.¹³ (3) N. S. B. Gras, with the assistance of members of the constituent societies, is studying categories of materials useful for research in the social sciences and humanities, especially with a view of discovering those not adequately cared for at present. Other important problems with which the Joint Committee has been concerned are: (a) durability of paper and ink; (b) policy of libraries in indexing and preserving newspapers; (c) a survey of state and local archives; (d) the practice of the federal government in the destruction of archival material; (e) a survey of manuscript and other source material relating to Virginia; and (f) an inventory of manuscript material for American history and literature. That this pro-

¹² Franklin F. Holbrook, *Survey of activities of American agencies in relation to materials for research in the social sciences and the humanities* (New York: Social Science Research Council; Washington: American Council of Learned Societies, 1932).

¹³ Robert C. Binkley, *Methods of reproducing research materials* (Ann Arbor, 1931).

gram of activities is exceedingly important in terms of preserving research materials becomes the more obvious, if we bear in mind that H. M. Lydenberg, assistant director of the New York Public Library and the president of the American Library Association, and L. V. Coleman, director of the American Association of Museums, are members of the Joint Committee. That provides a set-up in the Committee which will keep the problems of research libraries and museums to the fore. This committee becomes a promising clearing house for attacking some of the problems that must be met through joint action by research scholars, librarians, and directors of museums.

The Committee on Social Statistics¹⁴ (with which has been merged the council's Committee on the Utilization of Unpublished Social Data) is concerned with the improvement and preservation of statistical data for the social sciences. Of the activities of these two committees the following deserve mention here: (1) A project has been undertaken to standardize public welfare statistics. (2) In co-operation with the American Statistical Association an effort has been made to develop more adequately the task of critical evaluation and planning of the records which provide basic data for statistical researches. (3) In the case of the Bureau of the Census the committees have sought to do two things: to promote certain urgent immediate objectives, and to consider broad policies with reference to the future development of the Bureau of the Census. Among immediate objectives the committees have: (a) studied the Bureau's unpublished data that are at present unutilized by researchers;¹⁵ (b) indexed and classified the unpublished as well as the published data; (c) sought to procure the adoption by the bureau of a policy of indexing its published and unpublished data and source materials—especially on population, unemployment, the family, and vital statistics; (d) sought to determine which types of unpublished materials the bureau should preserve. This problem was urgent because of the removal of the bureau from its quarters in a temporary building to per-

¹⁴ Robert E. Chaddock, Chairman; Stuart A. Rice, Secretary.

¹⁵ C. Luther Fry, "Making use of census data," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, XXV (1930), 129-38.

manent, but smaller, quarters in the new Commerce Building. This removal necessitated the destruction of a considerable quantity of working material incident to tabulation.

In considering policies as to the future functions of the Bureau of the Census, the Committee on Social Statistics is interested in the extension of the usefulness of the bureau: (a) by publishing local bulletins which would make local data more available to schools, newspapers, and other local agencies; (b) by preparing studies on special problems on which census data are available; (c) by setting up a service function which would include working space for outside investigators, a technical library, and advisory personnel; and (d) by improving the methods of enumeration. The Committee on Social Statistics is also promoting the establishment of a "chair" or a Division of Records and Statistics in the Library of Congress to be concerned chiefly with collecting organization, board, commission, and agency reports and statistics.

In selecting ways in which it might further the development of research in the field of government, the council's Committee on Public Administration, under the chairmanship of Leonard D. White, launched a "State Public Document Center Plan." This plan originally provided for the designation of one or more libraries in each state that seemed peculiarly qualified and that were willing to undertake to collect, organize, and preserve as complete a file as possible of public documents and related material originating in that state. The plan did not seek to place any limitation on the collecting activities of any library, but sought to establish a nation-wide network of state document centers that would assume responsibility for collecting and preserving these primary source materials. By means of field work in most states an attempt was made to find one or two libraries that had already established as a part of their normal policy the collection of the primary source materials of their respective states—especially the official publications originating within the state. Attention was also given to finding such libraries, if possible, in strategic scholarly and geographic centers.

At the time of the meeting of the American Library Associa-

tion in New Orleans in April, 1932, the council had designated one or two libraries in each state as state document centers. The council felt, however, that the development of an active nation-wide movement to collect and preserve the primary source materials in each state was essentially a library function. Hence, it requested the American Library Association to take over the project for further development. This was done, and the project was turned over to its Public Documents Committee with the understanding that under its leadership an attempt be made to define the various types of research materials that should be preserved for the social sciences, and that such steps be taken as would promote an active movement for the collection and preservation of such materials in those states where this seemed especially necessary.¹⁶ This movement has in it promising possibilities for librarians and scholars to integrate the building of research collections with the changing needs of scholars and the varied opportunities for collecting activities in different states.

V. INDIRECT APPROACHES

So much for the direct efforts to carry out Objective III of the council of 1929, namely, to *enlarge, improve, and preserve the materials for research*. The development of the other six objectives projected at that time will perhaps have an equally significant effect upon the solution of these problems. An examination of some of the council's activities to carry out these six objectives of 1929, viewed from the standpoint of their significance for research libraries, is instructive. Among its activities to *improve the research organization* (Objective I), Southern and Pacific Coast regional committees and a number of local university social science research councils have been formed to adapt the council's program to local needs, or to initiate such research activities as are needed. In some instances one explicit phase of regional and of local council activity has concerned the preservation of primary source materials locally. As another phase of improving research organization, the council has asked each

¹⁶ For a detailed outline of the plan for the furthering of this project see the *Bulletin* of the American Library Association, XXVII (1933), 128-32.

of its constituent societies to set up special committees to consider the research need of its members. The result has been that:

Each society considered the problems of its discipline, and all or a majority indicated that among the matters of interest to themselves and to the Council were questions of personnel, the collection and preservation of research data, the establishment of new and the maintenance of existing media for publication, provision for the interchange of research information, increased co-operation with governmental agencies, and the desirability of regional conferences for workers with common interests.¹⁷

In some of the societies, a most searching survey was made to determine which source materials are of significance to researchers in their respective disciplines. Thus, the Committee on Research of the American Sociological Society sent a questionnaire to the membership of the society to study inductively the sources of value to sociologists, and the committee's report¹⁸ is based upon an interpretation and appraisal of the experience of 96 sociologists who participated in the inquiry. The Committee on the Planning of Research of the American Historical Association conducted a series of conferences, and its report¹⁹ is based upon the work of five subcommittees which prepared reports on the following subjects: ancient history; medieval history; modern European history; Eastern American history, and Western American history.

It requires no argument to prove that such reorientations and such efforts to improve the research organization in the social sciences mean that scholars will view the regional and local needs of their libraries from a different point of view, and the librarians can count on revitalized assistance from these scholars in the building up of source collections.

Further, in the council's planning it "regards the individual investigator with a problem of moment to him and with the technical training necessary for its investigation as the most

¹⁷ *Social Science Research Council. Eighth annual report, 1931-32*, p. 5.

¹⁸ Stuart A. Rice and Hugh P. Brinton, Jr., "The Problem of sociological source materials," *Pub. Amer. Sociol. Soc.*, XXVI, No. 3 (August, 1932), 204-5.

¹⁹ *Historical scholarship in America: needs and opportunities* (New York, 1932), p. 146.

critical factor in effective research."²⁰ Hence, Objective II—to develop research personnel. This project will indirectly affect the development of Objective III. In less than a decade the council has given more than 300 scholars an opportunity to participate in the work of its various committees concerned with research; 169 have received "grants in aid" to work on specific projects, and 230 have received fellowships. While these fellowships have been designed primarily to develop research personnel, nevertheless each fellowship has been conditioned upon the formulation of some promising research project. In its *Annual report, 1929-30*, the council pointed out that:

Although even the earlier fellows of the Council are still only four or five years removed from their fellowship experience, a gratifying number have already assumed important places in the movement to raise social science research in the United States to a plane of greater objectivity and realism. Partly, at least, as a result of the stimulus afforded by their fellowship opportunities, this younger generation of research workers bids fair to enrich the contributions which the social science of tomorrow may be expected to make toward a better understanding of human behavior.²¹

As a result of the experiences provided by the council's research activities, scholars learn to appraise the sources for research and discover their limitations, as well as what is essential to improve them. In nearly every project, data and their scientific treatment are regarded as of prime importance. Scholars working on projects necessarily influence librarians and the development of libraries. Through such scholars the purposes and collecting activities of libraries become redefined in terms of giving priority in acquisition programs to primary sources.

The council's efforts to *improve research methods* (Objective IV) will also affect the sources that will become the foundation for future social science research. The council's study of the scientific method in the social sciences and the intensive study of its committee on this subject from 1923 through 1929, which culminated in the publication of a *Case book on methods in social sciences*,²² will have a definite influence upon the methods, and hence also upon the product, of research of many scholars. It

²⁰ Social Science Research Council. *Annual report, 1928-29*, p. 3.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

²² Edited by Stuart A. Rice (Chicago, 1931).

will also have an influence upon the demands for primary sources that the scholars will make upon libraries.

As a phase of improving research methods and future sources, the existing available sources (making possible or limiting research) on certain projects receive critical evaluation, as has already been suggested. Thus, as one phase of the report of the President's Research Committee on Social Trends, an analysis of the statistical background of the subjects included in the report is nearing completion. Approximately thirty subjects have been covered by the several authors who have prepared the report on *Recent social trends in the United States*.²³ The analysis in question, which is the work of Stuart A. Rice of the University of Pennsylvania, and Florence DuBois, sets forth the important statistical series which are available for these subjects, with indication of the needs for significant series which are lacking. According to the authors:

The discussion is based upon actual inspection of statistical sources. A guide to the statistical series has been prepared, in which the data available are noted under numerous detailed headings, with cross references by which all material on a given subject is traced. The entries in the guide show precisely the statistical groupings under which the data are arranged and the years for which they are found. Those series which are available for 1930 or later are included and the references have been brought down to date as of January 1, 1933. Most of the statistical material cited is available in libraries, but some entries refer to unpublished material available only in the offices in which it has been compiled. A special example of this type of entry is the collection of items regarding statistics available by census tracts in the cities in which the tracts have been established by the United States Bureau of the Census. Most of the information on this subject has been collected by direct correspondence and is not available at present through the usual library sources.

The definitive character of this special report should make of it a milestone, not merely for social scientists, but also for those librarians who desire to improve their capacity to appraise social science sources.

Under Objective V the council is attempting to facilitate the dissemination of materials, methods, and results of investigation.

²³ New York, 1933.

A special Committee on Scientific Publication, the Joint Committee on Materials for Research, in its study of methods of reproducing research materials, and the committees on research of the constituent societies are grappling with the problem of making the results of scholarly research accessible to contemporary and future scholars. The need of providing more adequate facilities for publication of the products of scholarly research was stated emphatically by the Research Committee of the American Anthropological Society: "A point has clearly been reached when the total production of first-class ethnological, archaeological and linguistic data has far outstripped the opportunities for their publication, and inaccessible and therefore nearly wasted manuscript material is piling up alarmingly." This new emphasis by scholars upon more adequate provision for publication, and the council's serious attempt to solve this problem should result in finding ways and means for preserving the results of research in printed form in enough libraries to make them accessible to scholars.

The problem of *facilitating effective concrete investigations of human behavior* (Objective VI) has occupied the central focus of the council's activities. The research activities thus considered, or actually sponsored, will touch the building of better research sources in libraries at many points. In addition to grants in aid and fellowships, the typical method of facilitating research has been through advisory committees on projects or in fields in which definite research projects were proposed. Chart I tells a significant story as to breadth, variety, and continuity of the research interests of these committees. Some of these committees have had subcommittees, conferences, and a staff to develop a plan of research in their field. Thus the Committee on Industry and Trade has had subcommittees on unemployment, savings and capital formation, economic statistics, and public utilities. These special committees follow earlier committees on industrial relations, corporate relations, and business research.

The significance of the work of these committees becomes more apparent if we describe the procedure of a typical commit-

tee. It has been the function of each advisory committee first to try to see its field as a whole:

1. To determine the status of scientific research in its field;
2. To determine whether research is necessary, and if so, whether a research agency is necessary and practical;

CHART I

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL, 1922-32*

Committees	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927	1928	1929	1930	1931	1932	1933
1. Scientific method.....											
2. Social science abstracts.....											
3. Fellowships (general).....											†
4. Population.....											
5. Social and economic re- search in agriculture.....											
6. Crime.....											†
7. Grants in aid.....											†
8. International relations.....											†
9. Corporate relations.....											
10. Industrial relations.....											
11. Inter-racial relations.....											
12. Cultural areas.....											
13. Pioneer belts.....											
14. Business research.....											
15. Public administration.....											†
16. Family.....											
17. Scientific publications.....											
18. Regional—Pacific Coast and Southern.....											†
19. Social statistics.....											†
20. Materials for research.....											†
21. Social science personnel.....											†
22. Personality and culture.....											†
23. Industry and trade.....											†
24. Pressure groups.....											†

* Based upon annual reports.

† Continuing committees.

3. If a project wins the favor of the committee, definite recommendations are made to the Committee on Problems and Policy, covering the reasons why the project should be undertaken, the methods to be employed, the best existing agency for the work, suggestions as to personnel and an estimate of the time and money required. Frequently, advisory committees have started the work in their field of research by means of a

preliminary survey to determine the actual status of research methods, the available primary source data that will lend themselves to scientific treatment, the extent to which the field has been treated adequately in completed research, and what more needs to be done. The net result of the varied and numerous research activities of these committees will be the improvement of the quality and the enlargement of the products of research to be preserved by libraries. The publications of a single Committee on Social and Economic Research in Agriculture are convincing on this point.

Finally, the council's efforts to *enhance public appreciation of the significance of the social sciences* (Objective VII) will give an environment or the prerequisite condition for effective building of the permanent sources for social science research. The council has made the social sciences respected, and their new status in the public mind will be immensely helpful to librarians concerned with preserving source materials.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

This discussion indicates that under the influence of the Social Science Research Council the social sciences have been in a process of reorientation. It has developed co-operative research by men from related disciplines, resulting in an attack upon "inter-discipline problems." Out of the council's planning and varied research activities, there is emerging a more integrated point of view. Narrow departmental overspecialization and isolation are being superseded by integration.

But not only is a wholesome integration of disciplines discernible; one can also observe a change in emphasis. The dominant note, particularly on the graduate-school level, is research rather than teaching, and in this research the stress is upon data rather than authority—upon research by empirical methods utilizing primary sources rather than secondary sources or theoretical materials.

With such a new emphasis expressing itself in broad and involved inquiries, it was inevitable that the scholar's need for basic social data should quickly have outrun available resources,

despite America's extraordinary investment in research materials and the expansion of libraries in this century. Tested by these new demands, existing resources were all too often found to be too scattered, unco-ordinated and not readily accessible, or their existence was even unknown to scholars.

To attack the problems incident to the *improvement, enlargement, and preservation of research materials*, some of the above outlined activities have been initiated and sponsored by the Social Science Research Council. But more has happened. A new personnel is emerging in the social sciences—trained in more empirical methods—to join the older scholars who initiated and helped to develop such methods. As a result, significant, library developments are in process, especially in the larger universities that have local social science research councils. The development that has taken place in some of these universities indicates that social scientists and librarians will redefine their local policies so as to integrate the activities and resources of such libraries with the new and larger need of scholars for adequate source materials. Such integrated programs, in view of the developments that have already taken place in a number of universities, will perhaps include:

1. Leadership on the library staff trained in the social sciences for the purpose of building, operating, and maintaining competent collections of social science source materials.
2. A defined and accepted policy to build collections and library facilities definitely for research rather than for teaching. The two are distinctly different functions and each should be provided for according to the purposes and resources of a given institution.
3. A self-survey by interested librarians and social science research scholars:
 - a) To define the long-time research goals of scholars in a particular university that are reasonable and desirable in view of the institution's resources and obligations.
 - b) To select from certain basic sources those items needed to attain such research goals. At least seven groups or basic sources should be covered for each social science discipline: indispensable bibliographical and statistical tools and sources; the classic treatises in which each subject has become defined historically; the scholarly journals; public documents; newspapers; fugitive materials and maps.
 - c) To do such regional planning as is essential to define the library's re-

gional responsibilities, to co-ordinate and unify existing and potential research resources within strategic, scholarly centers and geographic areas in which co-operation is feasible. As a result of such regional planning necessary duplication should be determined, the omission of vital categories avoided, and a division of labor among libraries agreed upon. In such regional planning the splendid foundations laid by far-sighted librarians with the assistance of isolated scholars can be brought into consideration by means of certain bibliographical tools developed chiefly by librarians, such as the two union lists of serials. The projected "Union list of newspapers," sponsored by James T. Gerould's committee of the A.L.A., will also be of great use when completed. Other useful tools are the union card catalogues of the holdings of libraries, which serve as a basis for unifying the efforts of participating institutions.

4. An adequate budget:
 - a) For the acquisition of desirable material now in print;
 - b) To endow such developmental projects so as to insure their upkeep and efficient administration.
5. Recognition by the university's administration and authorities of the validity and importance of such a research program. Its place in the university's total program must be recognized and agreed upon as being at least of secondary importance—the faculty being first.

It is to be expected that these significant changes in the social sciences, which call for concomitant changes in the objectives, activities, and resources of university and research libraries, will have a bearing upon the training for librarianship in the social sciences. Social science librarians should have an understanding of which primary sources have value for social research. Their training should be for an advanced degree and should include: (1) primarily, training in one basic social science discipline and in closely related fields, in order to get an appreciation of the background of the social sciences; (2) a thorough training in methods and sources of research in the social sciences, with which the "foreground" is now being laid in these disciplines; and (3) such training in technical library processes as is essential.

AUGUSTUS FREDERICK KUHLMAN

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES

THE LIBRARY SERVICE IN GREAT BRITAIN: EFFECTS OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS

A YEAR ago in New Orleans I had the privilege of addressing the American Library Association assembled in its annual conference and took as my subject "The Development of the library service in Great Britain and Ireland since 1918." I described how the county service had grown in that period, how urban libraries had begun to recover from the inevitable stagnation of the war years, and how through the development of regional co-operation schemes and the National Central Library we were marching steadily toward the goal of a systematic and fully articulated national service—an objective which had never before been fully visualized.

Toward the end of my address I necessarily came to the problem of the position and prospects of national and local public libraries under the stress of enforced economy in public expenditure. Was the new movement going to be stopped or seriously retarded? Was the work of a decade to be thwarted and sterilized? I thought not, and gave, with (I hope) due diffidence, reasons for the faith that I had in the newly restored status of the service. Today we have before us the year's story with its facts and figures, and—which is of greater importance for present purposes—a pretty good idea of the financial provision which is being made by local authorities generally for the statistical year 1933-34.

On these two sets of figures it may confidently be asserted that the library has held its own during 1932-33 and that there is no reason whatever for pessimism during the year which has now begun. There are black spots, it is true; here and there are found records of sadly reduced book funds, and in many places more or less ambitious development programs have been slowed down or postponed altogether. The erection of new buildings has practically ceased,¹ and the government de-

¹ Except in certain big cities, such as Manchester and Sheffield, planned some time ago.

partment concerned has maintained an almost unvarying embargo against the raising of public loans for this purpose. Increases in staff and salary appropriations have naturally been comparatively rare, and many enthusiastic committees are straining at the leash and saying hard things about their financial taskmasters.

Still the fact remains that the new strength which the service has gained since the war is far too vital, and its status too widely recognized, for any serious setback to occur unless the national situation becomes worse instead of better. It is a case of *reculer pour mieux sauter*.

Take borough libraries first. The Carnegie United Kingdom Trustees, by reason of their policy of three-year book-purchase grants to municipal libraries in towns of 20,000-70,000 inhabitants, receive annual reports. In a small number of instances an instalment has had to be postponed owing to temporary non-fulfilment of important conditions; in others it has been thought right to waive less important conditions on an assurance that they will be implemented as soon as financial conditions improve; in the great majority of cases conditions have been fully met and instalments have been paid without comment. Local authorities, recognizing that improvements recently adopted have elicited a hitherto unsuspected volume of latent demand, have loyally admitted their obligation to maintain and develop the improved service. This is true of many authorities which received grants five and six years ago and are still maintaining the standard which was imposed during the three-year grant period.

The reality of this obligation is shown abundantly by the year's figures, which conclusively prove the popularity of a well-run service on modern lines—especially at a time of widespread unemployment. The transformation of a closed to a free-access library, the establishment of a children's section, the reconditioning of a long-stagnant stock, the appointment of a "live" librarian in place of the old-time caretaker—all or any of these improvements demonstrate in a few months that

hitherto many communities have wasted their library expenditure by spending either too little or in the wrong way.

So with the counties. It is true that the Carnegie trustees and their advisers had hoped during the years 1931-33 to see a big forward movement in the provision of urban-type branches in the more populous areas, and that this program has been slowed down, like all programs involving capital expenditure on buildings. But progress has been steady throughout the year. One or two authorities that have always been lethargic have relapsed into a somewhat more profound coma; certain others which had been spending with unusual liberality have somewhat restricted their book-buying. Yet, in general, authorities have earned the grants previously promised by the trustees, and others have accepted new grants, all based on condition that some definite advance will be made. Within the last few days (I write in April) reports have been received of two very rural county libraries moving into much larger premises, and as a rule budgets for 1933-34 are satisfactory. No less than seventeen authorities enlarged their premises during the year or built new ones.

In most respects, it may safely be said that library authorities generally have become alive to the fact that hitherto the importance of the service has been underrated, and that the so-called "depression" (a term used much more freely in the United States than in Britain) is a conclusive reason for at least maintaining if not for greatly developing it, in the light of recent experience and the new volume of demand.

Proceeding from local services to larger issues, we find even stronger ground for confidence. Those who attended the 1932 Annual Conference of the Library Association, held at Bournemouth under the presidency of Sir Henry Miers, could not fail to be impressed by the fact that the attendance was practically normal, and that, with due allowance for the inevitable percentage of "wet blankets," the spirit of the profession as a whole remained undaunted. The pessimists in meetings and hotel lounges were concerned mainly with orthodox, time-honored complaints about the public's inherent distaste for the "best" books and the alleged iniquities of committees, booksellers, and

literary critics. There was no sign of depression or panic. In point of fact, the Association has continued to grow steadily in numbers and its examination entrants have become more numerous than ever. On May 25 of this year the new headquarters—actually already occupied—are to be opened formally by the Right Honorable Stanley Baldwin, and it is hoped that this event will definitely mark the beginning of a new epoch of useful activity.

In another part of the same block of buildings, which are situated near the British Museum in the heart of London's new university center, will shortly be housed the National Central Library, the pivot or keystone of the national lending service. There will be stackroom for something like one million volumes, together with ample accommodation for the National Union Catalogue, the London Union Catalogue, and the Union Catalogue of the South-Eastern Regional Bureau. These catalogues, when complete, together with the growing Intelligence Department and the special or "outlier" libraries which co-operate, will make the National Central Library an institution of primary importance in the educational service of the nation.

The South-Eastern Regional Library Bureau, to whose catalogue reference was made in the preceding paragraph, has come into being during the last six months. It is the fourth of its kind, the others being those consisting of groups in the north of England, the West Midlands, and Wales. It will ultimately co-ordinate the library service of all the counties which border upon the metropolis whose libraries for the present form a separate unit for catalogue purposes, but which may eventually join this region. It will be a very powerful group, and the fact that it has come into being at a time of national financial difficulty is one more proof of the vitality and progressive spirit which has already been illustrated in the preceding paragraphs of this article. When the first conference was summoned with a view to the creation of this Bureau, there were some who thought that financial anxiety would be a barrier to its success. So far was this from being the case that a resolution moving the formation was carried unanimously without any criticism save

as regards the area which should be embraced. So far as is known, every library of any significance in the area has readily agreed to pay its due contribution to the running costs, and the Carnegie trustees have made a grant of £2,500 toward the initial cost of preparing the Union Catalogue. There are movements toward the same type of co-operation in Scotland, in the North Midlands, and in the Lancashire-Cheshire area, so that it may confidently be anticipated that in the next two or three years the whole of Great Britain will be regionalized for library purposes, with the National Central Library as the keystone of the arch.

Therefore, while, as I have said, expenditure has been restricted in a few library areas, there can be no question that in general the service is forging steadily ahead, conscious of its strength and directing its energies in accordance with clearly recognized principles.

J. M. MITCHELL

CARNEGIE UNITED KINGDOM TRUST
DUNFERMLINE, ENGLAND

SELECTING APPLICANTS TO A LIBRARY SCHOOL OR TRAINING CLASS: AN APPROACH TO A TECHNIQUE

THE original aim of this study was to devise objective criteria for the selection of library assistants. Since the data used are largely based on personnel records kept by a large public library, it is pertinent to describe the personnel methods used by the given library.

The library with its branches employs approximately 600 assistants known as professional workers. About 70 per cent of this number are civil-service employees assigned to positions in the library by the Civil Service Commission upon successfully passing prescribed examinations. The remaining 30 per cent represent graduates of the training class maintained by the library. The library possesses little information concerning the personal history and academic training of the civil-service employees. On the other hand, the library does have personnel records covering the graduates of its training class. Such records are of varying completeness and include application blanks, entrance-examination scores, library-training records, and intelligence scores.

In the case of civil-service employees, the library administration has little selective freedom, since it is more or less mandatory that assistants assigned by the Civil Service Commission be placed as vacancies occur. The problem of selection, however, does exist in admitting applicants to the training class. Although only fifteen or twenty are admitted each year to the training class, there are usually ten times this number who apply for admission. It is therefore important that the enrollment be limited to students who give evidence of ability to develop into the highest type of library assistant, especially since an accepted candidate is virtually assured of a library position upon graduation. Any error in selection would be doubly expensive, for the library can ill afford to dismiss a candidate after

giving her nine months of free instruction or to retain her, regardless of her incompetence. Up to the present, selection has been based in part on entrance examinations, school records, and, more recently, intelligence scores; but the number of qualified applicants so far exceeds vacancies in the training class that selection has rested largely on the subjective opinions of a few interviewers. This study undertakes to evaluate certain personality factors which by their presence or absence may contribute to one's success as a library assistant.

PROCEDURE

Since only a few personnel records are available, the number of library assistants who are training-class graduates being small, the records which the library had available were supplemented by a questionnaire. The questionnaire was made longer for the civil-service employees to cover information which the training-class graduates had given in their personnel records. In addition, two personality tests, Freyd's test of introversion-extroversion¹ and Wang's test of persistence,² were employed.

For the criterion of efficiency in library service a special rating scale was prepared. In constructing this efficiency rating scale consideration was given the theory that efficiency in various phases of library work may require different types of mind or personality. For example, a person may be successful in circulation work and fail in cataloguing, or an efficient cataloguer or classifier might make a poor assistant at the circulation desk. Some persons, of course, might be successful at both jobs while others could not do well at either. On these assumptions two general efficiency ratings were called for on the scale. One rating was to evaluate the library assistant's efficiency in working with books (cataloguing, classification) and the other to evaluate the assistant's efficiency in working with people (circulation work). Efficiency in work with books is hereafter referred to as Efficiency B; in work with people as Efficiency P. In addition

¹ M. Freyd, "Introverts and extroverts," *Psychological review*, XXXI (1924), 74-87.

² Charles K. A. Wang, "A Scale for measuring persistence," *Journal of social psychology*, III (1932), 79-90.

to the two general efficiency ratings, ratings on eighteen specific traits or characteristics, such as accuracy, tact, dependability, etc., were elicited for secondary information. These traits or characteristics were adapted from two textbooks in library science.³

A seven-point scale was used as the basis for rating—1 representing the most inefficient and 7 the most efficient. The ratings given any subject could easily be combined and averaged; thus, a person receiving a rating of 5 from two judges and 6 from a third would score 5.33, or slightly above the average for the specific type of ability judged.

Since there was no convenient way of assembling the library assistants to fill out the questionnaires and to take the personality tests, it was necessary to communicate with them by mail. Out of 560 assistants to whom questionnaires and test blanks were mailed, 321 responded, the percentage of response being 57.3. For each of the 321 respondents an effort was made to secure independent ratings from 3 associates who were best acquainted with the individual's work. Ratings were received on these 321 assistants as shown in the accompanying tabulation.

3 ratings on 112 individuals	1 rating on 72 individuals
2 ratings on 102 individuals	0 rating on 35 individuals

RESULTS

Correlations between each general efficiency rating and the personality tests, intelligence, and entrance examination, and intercorrelations between the general efficiency ratings and between the personality tests, are given in Table I. The low coefficients in all cases between the efficiency rating and test scores might indicate that the tests have practically no predictive value for determining efficiency in library service. This is somewhat disappointing for certain purposes of this study, but it is neither surprising nor discouraging, as will later be shown. The coefficient of -.47 between scores on persistence and introversion-extroversion agrees with the expected relationship between

³ J. M. Flexner, *Circulation work in public libraries* (Chicago, 1927), pp. 274 ff.; Margaret Mann, *The Classification and cataloging of books* (Chicago, 1928), pp. 413 ff.

the two measures⁴ and indicates that the tests have been taken conscientiously, even though they were administered by correspondence. The coefficient of .46 between the 461 individual pairs of efficiency ratings B and P and the coefficient of .44 between the average efficiency ratings B and P of 164 assistants indicate first that Efficiency B and Efficiency P, in the judgment of the raters—while somewhat different abilities—have, never-

TABLE I
CORRELATIONS BETWEEN EFFICIENCY RATINGS AND TEST SCORES
AND INTERCORRELATIONS OF RATINGS AND TESTS

	<i>r</i>	Number
Intelligence and Efficiency B.....	-.03	28
Intelligence and Efficiency P.....	.10	27
Entrance examination and Efficiency B.....	.14	77
Entrance examination and Efficiency P.....	.12	72
Introversion-extroversion and Efficiency B.....	-.07	274
Introversion-extroversion and Efficiency P.....	-.02	251
Persistence and Efficiency B.....	.03	276
Persistence and Efficiency P.....	.03	253
Introversion-extroversion and persistence.....	-.47	317
Efficiency B and Efficiency P:		
Individual.....	.46	461
Average.....	.44	164

theless, certain factors in common between them and, second, that there is a high degree of consistency among the judges in the ratings they made.

The library assistants were next divided into three groups, according to their efficiency ratings in work with books; and also into three groups according to their efficiency ratings in work with people. For each type of work the highest group included assistants whose average rating was 6.0 or higher; the lowest

⁴ Wang (*op. cit.*, p. 84) reports a correlation of .51 between the persistence test and Thurstone's "Personality schedule," which is often regarded as a test of introversion-extroversion.

group included those with an average rating of 3.5 or lower, or, if there was only one rating, when that rating was 2 or lower; and the middle group included those with an average rating between 3.5 and 6.0. It was necessary to include a wider range of ratings for the low group than for the high because of a noticeable tendency among all the judges to overrate.

In analyzing the responses of the assistants for the purpose of scoring efficiency, the frequencies of response of the high group and their test scores were compared with those of the low, the scores of the intermediate group being disregarded at this point. The number of cases in each group was as follows: for Efficiency B the high group contained 50, the low, 25; for Efficiency P, the high group contained 40, the low, 32. To make such comparisons it was necessary to devise a system for assigning values to the items which may or may not have contributed to an individual's efficiency. The method of assigning such values may best be demonstrated by taking an actual case.

One item on the questionnaire asked if the subject had traveled widely—that is, "had been abroad and many places at home." Of the group which had been judged highly efficient in work with books, 36 per cent had traveled widely, while of the group judged inefficient with books, only 16 per cent had traveled widely. The difference is thus 20 per cent. Now, on the other hand, the item "have traveled only occasionally" was checked by 16 per cent of the group judged efficient with books, and by 44 per cent of the group judged inefficient in this respect. The difference is thus -28 (16 - 44). The greatest negative value found in the whole questionnaire was 30 for efficiency with books and 35 for efficiency with people. Since it is awkward to handle negative values, they were eliminated by adding 30 to each of the differences between the groups judged for efficiency with books and 35 to each of the differences between the groups judged for efficiency with people. To illustrate, the score for "have been abroad and many places at home" becomes 50 ($30 + 20$), and for "traveled only occasionally" the score is 2 ($30 + -28$); both scores are for efficiency with books.

The scores thus derived being too large for convenient usage,

steps were taken toward reducing them. First a decimal point was inserted, making the two scores cited 5.0 and 0.2. Then the decimals were rounded off to the nearest .0 or .5, making the scores 5.0 and 0.0. The procedure here described was carried out for all of the items on the questionnaire, with respect to both efficiency with books and efficiency with people. The items and the derived scores are indicated on Table II.

In order to verify the validity of the scores on Table II, they were assigned to a random sampling of 100 assistants, and the scores thus assigned were correlated with the ratings of efficiency as furnished by the judges. In other words, if the scores on Table II are valid, they should show a high positive correlation with the judges' ratings. The coefficients of correlation resulting were $.44 \pm .054$ for efficiency with books and $.50 \pm .051$ for efficiency with people. Although these correlations are too low for individual prognostic purposes, they are as high as one may expect considering the limited number of factors investigated and the lack of more objective standards of efficiency. They are also high enough to be of practical value, as will presently be shown.

DISCUSSION

One of the items which yielded answer-variables capable of differentiating between the high and the low efficiency groups is that concerned with training in the library school. The data obtained indicate that the chances of low efficiency are greater in cases of no training than in those with it, and that the chances of high efficiency are further enhanced in cases where the assistants had seven to twelve months of library training. Furthermore, the proportion of training-class graduates is much greater in the high group according to each efficiency criterion than in the low. These results seem to argue strongly for the library-training class, although one might contend that since the function of the training class is to train for efficiency, the higher proportion of efficient assistants among training-class graduates is to be expected.

Another item which yielded significant frequency differences

TABLE II
SCORE WEIGHTS OF ITEMS FOR PROGNOSING LIBRARY EFFICIENCY

ITEM	SCORE	
	Efficiency B	Efficiency P
Books enjoyed:		
a) Social science.....	3.0	5.0
b) Biological science.....	3.5	3.5
c) Physical science.....	3.0	3.5
d) General fiction.....	4.0	4.5
e) Mystery and detective.....	1.0	4.5
f) Library professional.....	2.0	4.0
g) Philosophy and religion.....	1.0	3.5
h) Travel.....	4.0	5.5
i) Others.....	3.0	3.5
Travel:		
a) Abroad and many places at home.....	5.0	5.5
b) Widely but not abroad.....	4.0	2.0
c) Often but not widely.....	2.0	3.5
d) Only occasionally.....	0.0	2.0
e) Never traveled.....	3.0	3.5
Help family with income:		
a) None.....	4.0	3.5
b) Under 25 per cent.....	3.0	3.0
c) 25-50 per cent.....	3.5	5.0
d) 50-75 per cent.....	3.0	3.5
e) Over 75 per cent.....	2.0	3.5
f) Unknown.....	3.0	3.5
Other vocational ability:		
a) None.....	3.0	4.0
b) Clerical.....	1.5	1.0
c) Professional.....	3.0	4.0
d) Selling.....	3.0	4.5
Acquaintance among own sex:		
a) Wide acquaintance.....	3.0	3.5
b) Some intimate friends but more acquaintances.....	4.5	4.0
c) Only a few intimate friends.....	1.0	3.0
d) Practically no friends.....	3.0	3.5
Acquaintance among opposite sex:		
a) Wide acquaintance.....	3.0	3.0
b) Some intimate friends but more acquaintances.....	5.5	3.5
c) Only a few intimate friends.....	1.5	2.0
d) Practically no friends.....	2.0	3.5

TABLE II—Continued

ITEM	SCORE	
	Efficiency B	Efficiency P
Age started library work:		
a) Under 18.....	4.5	5.0
b) 18-21.....	1.0	2.5
c) 22-25.....	3.0	2.5
d) 26-29.....	4.0	4.5
e) Over 30.....	3.0	2.5
f) Unknown.....	3.0	3.5
Health:		
a) Good.....	1.0	3.5
b) Average.....	4.5	4.0
c) Fair.....	3.0	3.0
d) Poor.....	3.0	3.5
Physical defects:		
a) Hearing.....	3.0	3.5
b) Sight.....	1.5	2.0
c) None.....	4.0	3.5
d) Others.....	3.0	3.5
Work experience:		
a) None.....	4.0	5.0
b) Clerical.....	1.0	0.0
c) Professional.....	3.5	3.5
Length of service:		
a) Less than 6 months.....	4.0	5.5
b) 7-11.....	1.5	2.0
c) 12-23.....	3.0	3.0
d) 24 or more.....	2.0	2.0
Introversion-extroversion score:		
a) -16 or lower.....	6.5	4.5
b) Others.....	3.0	3.5
Persistence score:		
a) 90 or more.....	4.5	4.5
b) 60 or less.....	1.0	1.5
c) Others.....	3.0	3.5

between the high and low efficiency groups is that involving length of time in library service. The data show a marked tendency to rate higher those who have been in service longer than those whose periods of service were shorter. It is open to ques-

tion, however, whether the long-term employees are really more efficient or whether they have been overrated because of their longer service.

It was earlier stated that the low correlations between efficiency ratings and test scores given in Table II might seem to have no prognostic value in selecting library assistants. Closer examination of the correlation surfaces, however, revealed that although the coefficients in themselves are low, the surfaces do show that at least in the extreme scores, high in some cases and low in others, there are significant differences in the proportions of assistants rated high and low. It was on the basis of such ob-

TABLE III

TEST	SCORE	WEIGHT	
		Efficiency B	Efficiency P
Entrance examination . . .	{ 90 or over	4	3.5
	Below 90	3	3.5
Army alpha	{ 150 or over	5	5.0
	Below 150	3	3.5

servation that efficiency weights have been assigned to the test scores of persistence and introversion-extroversion (see Table II). Since there were so few cases where intelligence and entrance-examination scores were available for verification, efficiency weights assigned to such scores were not included in the efficiency scales. However, certain extreme scores on both examinations do suggest possibilities of having their efficiency weights included. If such examinations were given, appropriate prognostic weights would be as shown in Table III. These score weights⁵ should be used only when all applicants have taken the tests, and under such circumstances they may be added to the weight given in Table II.

It is regrettable that the validity of the efficiency scales resulting from this study cannot be further verified with the data

⁵ The weights assigned to the entrance examinations are applicable only to scores of the one referred to in this study. They are therefore of no value for scores on other entrance examinations.

at hand. Indeed, if the scales are to be validated, they must be applied to groups other than those employed in this study. It would make an interesting supplementary project to use the scales on another group of librarians and ascertain how the efficiency scores correlate with their efficiency ratings. Such a project, however, would involve new complications arising from differences in ratings, conceptions of efficiency, etc. An alternative plan would be to try out these efficiency scales in the library under investigation for three or five years. At the end of that period a comparison could be made of the proportion of efficient assistants among those selected according to their efficiency scores and among employees in service before the adoption of the new selective plan. Even this method can accord only approximate validity to the scales because of the marked tendency to give higher efficiency ratings to those with long-service records than those whose records are brief. However, if this plan were adopted, not only would it help to establish or disprove the validity of these efficiency scales, but also the accumulated data could easily be utilized in revising the scales and in further investigation.

Throughout this report we have assumed that efficiency ratings are valid as a criterion of efficiency in library service. Therefore, whatever results are obtained from this study are subject to the limitations of that assumption. It is conceivable that when standards of efficiency change, this study will likewise become obsolete. Until such changes become pronounced, however, the outline suggested in the following pages may at least in part achieve the practical aim which motivated this study.

From the results of this investigation a standardized application blank to be used as an efficiency scale has been prepared and is presented in an appendix. This blank should be scored according to the weights assigned to the various responses as shown in Tables II and III. Since this blank contains efficiency weights assigned to the entrance examination,⁶ the army alpha intelligence test, Freyd's test of introversion-extroversion, and

⁶ See n. 5.

Wang's scale for measuring persistence, it is of course necessary that these tests be administered before the total efficiency scores are determined. The use of any or all of these tests, however, may be optional, although a uniform procedure is urged. Particularly when it is desired to compare the total prognostic efficiency scores of two candidates, it is essential that credits be given to exactly the same items on the efficiency scale.

When these tests are given, the test scores are of selective value in themselves aside from the part they contribute to the total efficiency scores. In the case of the entrance examinations now in use,⁷ it is suggested that candidates be eliminated if their score is under 55. In the case of the intelligence test, candidates with scores of under 100 may be removed from further consideration. On the test of introversion-extroversion, it is probably safe to eliminate the extreme introverts, i.e., those with a score of +20 or more. With regard to the persistence scale, there is probably little to lose in eliminating candidates with a score below 60.

If all four of these tests are used, and the efficiency weights entered on the application blank, the total efficiency scores should reach 37.5 for efficiency with books or 47.5 for efficiency with people, if the applicants are to merit further consideration. Whenever one of the four tests is omitted, a deduction of 3.0 for efficiency with books and 3.5 for efficiency with people must be made from the critical scores. If these processes of elimination are only mechanically carried out, there may be instances of injustice in exceptional cases. If, however, they are supplemented by intelligent observation on the part of the interviewer, such occasional errors might be avoided, although this subjective judgment is by no means encouraged.

The eliminative measures suggested should greatly reduce the number of candidates for the training class. If the number remaining is still too large, the problem, of course, becomes one of selection. In such an event, it is not necessarily recommended that only those with the highest efficiency scores be accepted. Until the problem is thoroughly investigated and a solution

⁷ *Ibid.*

reached on the basis of empirical results, it is probably best that selection from qualified candidates be left to the judgment of experienced interviewers. It is hoped, however, that after applying the eliminating processes outlined above, the interviewer will have a much smaller number of candidates to select from than under the prevailing system, although the task of selection may seem more difficult.

APPENDIX*

APPLICATION TO TRAINING CLASS

Name.....	Date.....
Home address.....	Tele.....

Schools attended (Give name and city)	Inclusive dates	Year graduated	Degree
--	--------------------	-------------------	--------

High school:

College:

Others:

REFERENCES: Give the names and addresses of three persons, former teachers or employers, who are not related to you and who know you well enough to speak fairly about you or your work.

Name	Address	Occupation
.....
1.....
2.....
3.....

(Do not write in the space below. Turn to next page.)

Entrance examination:

Written test.....	Efficiency B
Interviews	Efficiency P

Average
Army alpha
Personal traits

* This is a suggested standardized application blank and efficiency prognosis scale.

SELECTING APPLICANTS TO A LIBRARY SCHOOL 265

	Efficiency B—cont'd	Efficiency P—cont'd
Self-appraisal schedule
Application

TOTAL

PERSONAL DATA: Please give information about yourself as directed below.

Be sure to answer every question by putting a check-mark in the space before the answer that applies to you. Any omission will be counted against you.

1. My age is (1) 17 years or under
..... (2) Between 18 and 21
..... (3) Between 22 and 25
..... (4) Between 26 and 29
..... (5) 30 years or older
2. During the last two years the general condition of my health has been
..... (1) Good
..... (2) Average
..... (3) Fair
..... (4) Poor
3. I have (1) Defective hearing
..... (2) Defective sight (wearing glasses included)
..... (3) No physical defects
..... (4) Other defects as follows.....
4. In travel experience I have
..... (1) Been abroad and many places at home
..... (2) Traveled widely but not abroad
..... (3) Traveled often but not widely
..... (4) Traveled only occasionally
..... (5) Never been away from home
5. If necessary I can competently earn an income from
..... (1) Doing clerical work (e.g., bookkeeping, stenography, typing, clerking, etc.)
..... (2) Doing professional work (e.g., teaching, nursing, writing, social service, etc.)
..... (3) Direct selling (selling by calling on prospects)
..... (4) None, having had no special vocational training or experience
6. I have had the following working experience:
..... (1) None
..... (2) Clerical work (e.g., bookkeeping, stenography, typing, clerking, etc.)

- (3) Professional work (e.g., teaching, nursing, writing,
social service, etc.)

- (4) Direct selling

My total working experience is

- (1) Less than 6 months
..... (2) Between 7 and 11 months
..... (3) Between 12 and 23 months
..... (4) Over 24 months

7. If I have a job now, a portion of my salary will have to go toward helping my family as follows:

- (1) None
..... (2) 25 per cent or less
..... (3) Between 25 and 50 per cent
..... (4) Between 51 and 75 per cent
..... (5) 76 per cent or more

8. For pleasure reading I especially enjoy

- (1) Social sciences (history, economics, sociology, etc.)
..... (2) Biological sciences
..... (3) Physical sciences
..... (4) General literature (e.g., fiction, biography, drama,
poetry, etc.)
..... (5) Mystery and detective stories
..... (6) Philosophy and religion
..... (7) Travel and adventure
..... (8) Others.....

9. Among my own sex I have

- (1) Wide acquaintance but no special friends
..... (2) Some intimate friends but more acquaintances
..... (3) Only a few intimate friends
..... (4) Practically no friends

10. Among the opposite sex I have

- (1) Wide acquaintance but no special friends
..... (2) Some intimate friends but more acquaintances
..... (3) Only a few intimate friends
..... (4) Practically no friends

CHARLES K. A. WANG

KAIFENG, CHINA

GRADUATE THESES ACCEPTED BY LIBRARY
SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES FROM
JUNE, 1928, TO JUNE, 1932¹

HAVING listed the graduate theses recently accepted by library schools, one's first impulse is to present the list without comment. But later temptations are more seductive. There are, for example, the temptations represented by the following questions: What is the field of librarianship as defined by the 148 theses reported? How evenly are the theses spread over this field? Are most theses written on the problems of most importance to the library profession at the present time? And are any important problems disregarded?

Such questions as these can be answered to some extent by a proper analysis of the theses. But the difficulties of assembling the theses are such that to have borrowed and read them all before preparing a report by the date specified was entirely impracticable. Consequently only one-fifth of the total number has been read—a fact which naturally prevents any thorough-going analysis.

Notwithstanding this obstacle, one means of analyzing the theses remains, namely, a classification of titles. In so far as the titles are self-explanatory, and in so far as they indicate what the theses are about, their classification should at least reveal trends in the selection of thesis subjects. The problems to which differing numbers of theses are addressed may fairly be compared with the problems now confronting any cultural institution compelled to justify its continued existence under the new economic dispensation.

To classify the theses so as to permit this comparison is not easy. It is not enough for the classes to cover the technical problems of library administration, to which most of the theses are naturally devoted. They should, in addition, cover prob-

¹ Prepared at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Research of the Association of American Library Schools.

lems of a more general sort, especially problems involving the administrative policies of any agency for the distribution of reading matter.

The attempt to meet both conditions has produced a list of headings which doubtless better represent the range of current professional literature as a whole than the theses themselves. Because of this lag between service problems and theses, the same headings should make for interesting comparisons some five years later when the important problems we are facing now have had time to find fuller academic expression.

Such possibilities of future use, however, will scarcely justify what some may consider the needless extravagance of several more classes than there are theses to occupy. While a full discussion of the considerations involved would throw the present article out of focus, we can scarcely refrain from stating some of the more important reasons for deciding that the headings should represent a logical analysis of the wide range of problems that now concern the profession.

Upon every surviving social institution like the library, and especially upon the tax-supported library, a change in economic and social values, like that we are now witnessing, places the obligation to restate its aims and to redemonstrate its benefits. The institution, of course, may either accept or repudiate this obligation. If it repudiates, it becomes an institution which history will memorialize as a peculiar manifestation of the age that produced it. If it accepts the obligation, it must dig deep into human nature and discover ways of meeting perennial needs which the new régime will sanction.

There is no question, of course, but that libraries will endure, as they always have endured, if only for the purpose of preserving records that each age considers important—witness the pyramids of Gizeh. But now the question of most immediate importance is how many and which of the other recreational and educational values to contemporary society, as urged by the American public library in justification for generous public support, can be made convincing to the present taxpayers and city councils.

It is obvious enough that this question should receive a full measure of professional attention. How honestly it is answered depends upon the present vitality of American librarianship. How acceptable the answer may prove to the political economy of the present era depends upon how clearly the profession recognizes the major social problems confronting every community today and upon how fully the profession co-operates with governments in their solution. Efforts spent in defining the specific contribution of the library to problems recognized by local governments as the most acute should bring a large return in popular support.

Most of us who have digested the more important diagnoses of our present social ills like *Recent social trends*² will doubtless agree that two major problems are so recognized: what profitable uses of leisure time are attractive enough to the various social groups to take up the inevitable slack in employment, and how may we best communicate to the citizen at large the ideas he needs in order to withstand the many well-organized attempts to take advantage of his ignorance regarding complicated public affairs.

Librarianship has potentially an effective solution for both problems: the enrichment of leisure and the communication of important ideas to all literate citizens. How useful the library can be in meeting either problem depends partly upon the scope of the library's present influence, but depends mainly upon how directly the problems are attacked.

To attack the problems directly may require some change in professional attitudes toward the reading needs of the community. For example, some studies may best proceed from the assumption that the economic situation requires the public library, by analogy with the tax-supported schools, to identify those now receiving its benefits in order to make plain that it reaches a sufficiently large and diversified part of the population to justify public support; to show that certain benefits of reading are not so readily obtained from other distributing agencies;

² *Recent social trends in the United States: report of the President's Research Committee on Social Trends* (New York, 1933).

and to specify the scope of benefits peculiar to library services. From this point of departure, the definition of the library's social benefits is a task to which some students of librarianship should devote their full energies. The problems which need to be studied from this point of view have consequently suggested our headings.

On this basis the selected headings may suggest the information essential to a planned economy of reading distribution. The research problems involved are plainly indicated by our need for facts regarding the subtopics in each category and of the facts concerning their interrelations. That is to say, we need first to distinguish the various groups of readers and the various types of reading available in typical communities. We may then identify types of literature read by each group from each source of supply. Such information should show where the library fits into the general distribution of reading in each community studied. Not otherwise can we properly determine the present nature and scope of public-library services. When that has been done, we may attack the questions of the library's future contribution to the problems of recreation and education with greater assurance.

It may be questioned whether any library system or any other agency for the distribution of popular reading matter can develop a planned economy without adequate information concerning the sort of reading obtained by each group of potential customers from each of the other local sources of supply. On the basis of its historical origins in this country and its social services to date, it is possible that the public library's chief strength lies in supplementing other agencies. What renders such information highly necessary at the present time is the fact that it should be no less useful to each of the other distributors than to the public library; hence for this very reason the information is of most use to the cultural program of the community as a whole. For the library to work out the reading phases of such a community program would abundantly demonstrate the unselfish leadership which the institution may now assume.

But the return to the library itself as an institution is quite

likely to be the lion's share. With such information at its disposal, the library may define its clientèle in terms of the reading groups not adequately served by other agencies, define its holdings in terms of the reading matter not available to certain groups from other local sources, and define its administrative policies in terms of the conditions known to encourage socially useful reading by people whom the other agencies do not reach. The headings by which the theses at the close of this article are classified accordingly anticipate the information required to supply such definitions.

TABLE I
SUBJECTS DISCUSSED BY LIBRARY-SCHOOL THESES

Subject	Per Cent	Number of Theses
Descriptions of current library practices	27	41
Bibliography	22	32
History and surveys of libraries	15	22
Printing	9	13
Library training and personnel	8	12
Library organization	8	11
All others	11	17
Total	100	148

Trusting that the foregoing reasons for the choice of headings may be found plausible if not persuasive, we may proceed to the questions stated at the outset. Of these the first is: "What is the field of librarianship as defined by the theses?" In discussing this question there is no reason to suppose that the answer based upon our classification of titles would be significantly altered by a different classification of titles. It is also probable that the answer would be much the same if the contents of each thesis had been analyzed and each element classified separately, though this, of course, could only be known by experiment.

The field of librarianship as defined by the titles is described in general terms in Table I. The headings for three of the classes are ambiguous, namely, "Description of current library practices," "Library organization," and "All others." The forty-

one theses classed as description of current practice are subdivided as follows: twelve on cataloguing and classification, nine on book selection, eight on educational activities, five on library extension, two on interlibrary lending, two on lending and circulation, and three on general practices. Library organization, with the exclusion of historical and survey treatments, is represented by eleven theses—two on legislation, four on finance, two on buildings, and three on holdings. "All others" includes seventeen theses: seven in the field of reading, three on publishing, four on criteria for library services, and three on sources and methods of research.

To generalize slightly, it may be said that one-half of the theses are written either to describe certain library processes like cataloguing or to describe certain books and types of books. The other half is divided somewhat evenly among printing, library organization, library personnel, and miscellaneous, except for the preponderance of library history and library surveys. Such topics no doubt serve to describe the field of librarianship as defined by the theses. The number of titles on the various topics also suggest to some extent their relative importance in the judgment of library-school instructors and students.

Passing to the question of the professional importance of the more popular thesis subjects, we must venture on very thin ice. Any comment on this question must reckon with the facts that the relative professional importance of a given problem may be determined upon so many different bases that any one estimate is highly subjective.

Again, the selection of problems for investigation is and should always remain the student's own responsibility. Research made to order usually lacks the divine fire. And finally, of the theses herein considered, nearly all of which are Masters' theses, about as many were doubtless written to give the student needful training in the use of reference aids and in the organization of a report as were written to increase the store of professional wisdom.

In the light of such considerations even the following modest observations are offered with much hesitation.

Notwithstanding the impossibility of accurate discrimination among the three types of bibliography in Section II of the list, when classifying theses by title alone, the fact that only one could be definitely placed under "Critical bibliography" is food for thought. It would seem that practicing librarians would benefit much by methods whereby a given title or class of titles might be evaluated by known responses of different sorts of readers, among other objective criteria. Yet of the thirty-two theses classed as bibliography, many reach no farther in this direction than a subjective description of conditions attending the composition, or a reporting of facts concerning the organization, of the book, edition, or series. To what extent the accepted criteria of other disciplines are utilized, e.g., literary and historical criticism, cannot be told from the titles.

Studies of library organization (legislation, financing, political control, etc.) would likewise appear to merit a larger emphasis in the theses. The fact that so much of the librarians' experience with these problems is unrecorded may account for the scarcity of sources, which may in turn explain the difficulty of producing acceptable treatments of the problems without more field work than most students can afford. If this assumption is valid, we have indicated a professional service that only the practicing librarian can render.

In connection with the last point one may appropriately urge greater use of opportunities for collaboration with other academic departments. We shall return to this later. But the present urgency of problems affecting library legislation, library financing, and the value of library services to particular population groups is plain. It is equally plain that such problems cannot possibly receive adequate treatment by library-school students except as such students are directed by the faculties of law, political science, business administration, sociology, *et al.* Hence, the cross-fertilization of librarianship with other disciplines would appear to be the first step in producing a more satisfactory crop of library theses. The fact that each of the

library schools reporting graduate theses is located at a university within easy reach of such faculties renders more conspicuous the academic isolation reflected by their output.

Previous studies have shown that a large proportion of library-school students tend to concentrate on history and literature during their undergraduate years. This fact may explain not merely the large number of theses on the history of libraries and on the descriptive phases of bibliography, but also the library-school students' greater familiarity with sources and techniques of investigation in history and literature than in other academic fields.

It is less easy to explain the relative emphasis of library history in terms of present professional importance. Familiarity with the social conditions which attended the early development of typical American libraries and sometimes produced a general demand for scholarly works may conceivably prevent the immature student from grasping the present realities. This danger is the more serious when, as against the sixteen historical theses, not one can be identified by its title as an analysis of contemporary social conditions affecting the nature and scope of the demand for reading of specified types.

The last question mentioned at the outset of this paper asks: "What important professional problems, if any, are disregarded by the theses?" We have previously said that for all practical purposes a man's judgments concerning the relative importance of anything are essentially his own business, since the scope and character of his experience must determine his criteria. For this reason no one can say that certain problems are not important. However, to the extent that the headings used in classifying the titles are taken to represent the subjects involved in a socially adequate library science, some important subjects not covered are indicated by the headings under which no titles appear. Needless to state, the number of such titles would be much larger if they embraced the many problems of psychology and sociology no more remote from the problems of public-library administration than is, for example, the interesting

field of printing. Printing accounts for thirteen of the one hundred and forty-eight theses, almost one-tenth.

Yet because this method of analysis depends so largely on the choice of the headings themselves, we may employ another, namely, a comparison between the number of library-school Masters' theses and of non-library-school Doctors' theses written on the same subjects during the same period.

A convenient source for this purpose is *A List of American doctoral dissertations printed in 1930*, published by the Library of Congress.³ The list contains 695 titles, a very fair sample as compared with the 148 Masters' theses in library science. During the year 1930, the middle year from 1928 to 1932, the Doctors' theses accepted by the American universities granting most third degrees numbered about 40 per cent of the Masters' degrees granted by the same schools. Hence the Doctors' theses accepted during this period doubtless represent a considerably larger amount of academic emphasis upon the subjects treated than would the same number of Masters' theses.

Of the 695 titles, 84⁴ can be classified under the headings used for the Masters' theses in library science to indicate the distribution of general academic interest among the subjects related to library problems.

Table II compares the per cent of library-school Masters' theses and of non-library-school Doctors' theses on the twelve library subjects covered by the latter. As the reader may well imagine, no intelligent selection could be made from the Doctors' theses in the field of history. All were accordingly ignored, which explains the omission of historical theses in the table. Also, some of the nineteen Doctors' theses classed under "Research" would probably fit other library headings if the theses had been read. While there is no desire to make the comparisons prove too much, as they easily might, the percentages are perhaps as valid an indication as might be found of the academic

³ Washington: U.S. Printing Office, 1932.

⁴ The 84 titles are listed by number below Table II to permit reclassification by others.

importance attaching to the divisions we have added to the more familiar divisions of library science.

TABLE II*

COMPARISON, BY NUMBER, OF LIBRARY-SCHOOL MASTERS' THESES AND
NON-LIBRARY-SCHOOL DOCTORS' THESES ON SUBJECTS
DISCUSSED BY THE LATTER

SUBJECTS	M.A. LIBRARY		PH.D. NON-LIBRARY	
	No.	Per Cent of 148	No.	Per Cent of 84
I. Reading and readers:				
1. Facts concerning groups of readers . . .	3	2	2	2.4
2. Social problems involving reading . . .	0	0	7	8
3. Psychology of reading . . .	0	0	11	13
4. Factors in the selection of reading . . .	4	3	3	3.4
5. Evidence concerning the effects of reading . . .	0	0	5	6
II. Publications:				
6. Bibliography . . .	32	22	26	31
7. Printing . . .	13	9	1	1.2
III. Agencies for the distribution of reading matter:				
8. The news agency . . .	0	0	2	2.4
9. The library				
a) Legislation . . .	2	1	2	2.4
b) Finance . . .	4	3	5	6
c) Personnel . . .	12	8	1	1.2
IV. Research—sources and methods:				
10.	3	2	19	23
	73	50	84	100

* The doctoral theses counted in Table II are shown below by serial number as listed in *A List of American doctoral dissertations printed in 1930*. The number of each topic refers to the headings of Table II.

Topic No.

- 1. Theses nos.: 137, 321
- 2. Theses nos.: 390, 516, 644, 696, 703, 820, 830
- 3. Theses nos.: 217, 268, 464, 503, 529, 577, 614, 642, 760, 817, 847
- 4. Theses nos.: 46, 445, 448
- 5. Theses nos.: 12, 221, 308, 388, 533
- 6. Theses nos.: 18, 26, 27, 80, 89, 138, 142, 163, 204, 232, 233, 257, 265, 372, 400, 491, 689, 720, 733, 732, 807, 809, 831, 868, 908
- 7. Theses no.: 406
- 8. Theses no.: 221, 923
- 9a. Theses no.: 1, 329
- 9b. Theses nos.: 87, 561, 707, 841, 863
- 9c. Theses no.: 470
- 10. Theses nos.: 39, 45, 191, 207, 245, 484, 551, 553, 560, 620, 653, 731, 733, 734, 783, 805, 824, 874, 881

On two subjects only do we find a larger proportion of library-school theses, namely, printing and personnel. There is evidently small academic interest in printing, since we found only one Doctor's thesis on the subject. Personnel studies are numerous, but since no Doctor's thesis directly concerned library personnel as such, and only one came close enough to be counted, this subject belongs entirely to the library school.

On each of the remaining subjects, the proportion of the Doctors' theses is larger, and in some cases much larger, than the proportion of the library-school theses. That the basis of comparison is fair may be inferred from the roughly equivalent attention to bibliography by both groups. As already explained, the same equivalence might be expected in attention to historical subjects, had the selection been feasible. It is thus inaccurate to suppose that the eighty-four titles selected from the Doctors' list are unfairly weighted in favor of the sociological, psychological, and governmental aspects of librarianship on which the library theses are scant. If any serious error in selection was made it is believed to lie on the other side.

Had the same results appeared from comparisons between library-school theses and those of any other single academic department or professional school, they would mainly reflect the structural differences between the two fields. However, the pooling of all published doctoral theses of all graduate departments in all American institutions during a corresponding period probably eliminates such differences and renders the percentages fairly comparable.

The problems peculiar to the specialized techniques of librarianship should be expected to preponderate among the library-school theses, as they do. Such problems are those the profession may be said to have conquered. The problems involving librarianship only because they represent human needs responsive to good reading should preponderate in the studies by other departments, as they do again. Problems of this latter type are of interest to anyone concerned with the cultural status of the American community. Part of this interest may be due to the fact that the problems are as yet unsolved, whether by the

library or by any other craft. The library's inattention to such problems to date can be justified by its preoccupation with its own technical problems, which must be solved by librarians if they are to be solved at all.

But the point of the present article is to suggest (1) that, having largely mastered its technical problems, the profession may well lift its eyes to the problems which lie beyond; (2) that such problems, while broadly social and political in character, are none the less amenable to systematic study; (3) that because such problems are so broad in scope they are common to all agencies engaged in the distribution of reading matter; (4) that the library is under a heavier moral obligation than any other such agency to study the problems from the standpoint of community welfare, by reason of the fact that it is the only one to receive public support; (5) that attention to such problems is the more urgently demanded by the present economic situation, if only as a means of defining intelligent economies; (6) that the social importance of several such problems is attested by the attention they receive from graduate students in other fields whose interest is presumably free from any vocational bias; (7) that collaboration with such graduate departments is prerequisite to their satisfactory solution; and (8) that the presence of competent representatives of such departments in the universities embracing our graduate library schools affords the library schools an unparalleled opportunity to attack the problems—to attack them not merely in the interests of the entire library profession, but also in the interests of the fuller understanding and the consequent enrichment of American cultural institutions.

It will be interesting to discover, when another five years have passed, how well the library schools have met this challenge.

APPENDIX

A CLASSIFICATION OF 148 LIBRARY-SCHOOL THESES

I. Readers and reading

A. Facts concerning readers and non-readers

E.g.: Facts concerning the age, sex, schooling, occupation, nationality, and other traits of persons known to have read or known not to have read particular materials obtained from particular

sources (newsstand, bookstore, public library, *et al.*) or from all sources, as an indication of the relative local demand for reading matter of different types from different sources.

B. Actual reading by populations, population groups, and individuals

E.g.: Percentage of annual library loans made to each occupational group of each sex in the community, as an indication of the service rendered by a given agency to a given group.

C. Social problems and tendencies involving reading

E.g.: The social status of reading in a given community, i.e., the book-reading population compared with the radio and picture-theater populations in respect to size, economic status, education, *et al.*, as an indication of the relative local importance of different sources of recreation.

D. Psychological problems and tendencies

E.g.: Relation between vocabulary difficulty of selected books and the relative extent to which the books are read by persons representing different amounts of schooling, as an indication of the effect of vocabulary upon "readability."

E. Factors in the selection of reading by individuals or groups

E.g.: Relative appeal of such factors as the subject treated, preference for a given author, ease of obtaining a given title, extent to which it is advertised, etc., as indicated by the amount of reading done by specified groups of readers in titles so selected as to represent each factor in different degrees.

F. Social and psychological effects of reading

E.g.: Comparison of groups otherwise similar but differing in specific reading behavior, as an indication of traits associated with particular sorts of reading; tests at different intervals to determine how long and how well different sorts of reading are remembered.

II. Reading matter, publications

A. Enumerative bibliography

E.g.: Publications listed by subject, by author, by date, by format, by printer, etc., as an indication of reading matter available.

B. Descriptive bibliography

E.g.: Publications of a given class described by similarity and contrasts of selected features, e.g., content, editions, sources used, etc., or by facts about the given publications.

C. Critical bibliography

E.g.: Evaluation of publications by means of generally applicable and hence objective standards, i.e., examination of technical writing for misstatements of fact, use of historical methods to establish authorship, etc.

D. Printing

E.g.: The imprints, history, methods, and influences of printers and schools of printing.

III. Administration of distributing agencies

E.g.: How communities differ in their supplies of reading matter and in the relative local importance of the various distributing agencies, as an indication of the need for competing services.

A. The publisher

1. Publication trends by publisher, number of titles, date, subject, author, *et al.*
2. Description and evaluation of methods used in selection of titles, editing, manufacture, advertising, and marketing.
3. Social effectiveness, areas reached, types of reading stimulated, etc.

B. The news agency

1. Items sold described in price, frequency of publication, content, titles, *et al.*
2. Methods of selection and marketing.
3. Social influences: sales trends, areas covered, description of readers served, *et al.*

C. The bookstore

1. Classification, geographical distribution, and history of booksellers, jobbers, etc.
2. Holdings, turnover, *et al.*
3. Financing, sales methods, discounts, etc.
4. Patronage described in regard to titles purchased by different groups, economic status of book-buyers, response to various advertising appeals, etc.

D. The rental library

1. Holdings—size, classes, trends, etc., of typical rental libraries.
2. Methods of operation.
3. Social significance—circulation trends; clientèle; number, geographical distribution, and types of rental libraries; nature of competition with other agencies, etc.

E. Other commercial agencies

Book clubs, subscription libraries, etc.

F. Libraries

1. Essential factors in library organization—aims, functions, social values, etc.
2. History of libraries.
3. Surveys—general description of type libraries.
4. Legislation.
5. Finance.

6. Buildings.
7. Holdings.
8. Personnel, e.g., training (curriculums and methods), duties, and efficiency.
9. Library practices (general).
 - a) Book selection (recommended titles, *et. al.*).
 - b) Orders and accessions.
 - c) Cataloguing and classification.
 - d) Locating information in books (reference work).
 - e) Lending and circulation.
 - f) Interlibrary loan.
 - g) Educational activities.
 - h) Extension—relations with other organizations.
10. Criteria for services.
 - a) Testimony—social influences of library.
 - b) Services to particular groups of readers.
 - c) Competition and co-operation with other agencies for the distribution of reading matter.

IV. Research—sources and methods

E.g.: A description of problems, sources of data, methods of securing data from sources, and criteria for interpretation of data.

LIST OF THESES

I, B⁵

(Actual Reading by Populations)

1. CAMPBELL, CLARA EVELYN. *A Study of children's reading in the Larchmont (N.Y.) public library*, 1928, M.S. (Columbia).
2. MOSHIER, L. MARION. *A Comparison of the reading interests of a selected group of adults in New York City and a similar group in a town in New York State*, 1931, M.S. (Columbia).
3. UNGER, NELL AVERY. *Reading interests of the alumni of Reed College, Portland, Oregon*, 1930, M.S. (Columbia).

I, E

(Selection of Reading)

1. CROMPTON, MARGARET. *A Technique for describing the reading interests of adults*, 1929, M.A. (Chicago).
2. HARRINGTON, MILDRED P. *A Technique for describing children's reading interests*, 1931, M.A. (Chicago).

⁵Symbols dividing the theses refer to the corresponding section of the outline.

3. STONE, JOHN PAUL. *Factors influencing reading choices*, 1930, M.A. (Illinois).
4. TAYLOR, MARY DELIA. *Elements of popularity in fiction*, 1930, M.A. (Illinois).

II, A

(Enumerative Bibliography)

1. BEETLE, CLARA. *French sources of aid to cataloguers in the verification of French names, persons, societies and institutions. An annotated bibliography with an introductory essay*, 1930, M.S. (Columbia).
2. BROWN, EDNA MAE. *Indiana State documents*, 1930, M.A. (Illinois).
3. BULL, MARY LOIS. *Government publications in the field of fine arts*, 1929, M.A. (Illinois).
4. CARLSON, PEARL GERTRUDE. *English and American authors; editions and reference aids recommended for the reference room of a college or university library*, 1928, M.S. (Columbia).
5. PIERCE, CATHARINE J. *Some sources of information for American biography. A study of certain types of printed sources which either supplement or correct the Dictionary of American Biography*, 1931, M.S. (Columbia).
6. PORTER, DOROTHY BURNETT. *Afro-American writings published before 1835, with an alphabetical list (tentative) of imprints written by American negroes, 1760-1835*, 1932, M.S. (Columbia).
7. RICHARDS, JOHN STEWART. *Bibliographical materials for a literary history of Joaquin Miller*, 1932, M.A. (California).
8. ROGERS, HARRIET C. *Books in medicine, botany and chemistry printed in the American colonies and United States before 1801; a study of the rise of scientific publishing in America during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with an appended check-list of imprints (1668-1800)*, 1932, M.S. (Columbia).
9. SHAW, RALPH ROBERT. *Engineering books available in America prior to 1830*, 1931, M.S. (Columbia).
10. SISLER, RUTH. *Annotated bibliography of magazine articles on library work with children*, 1928, M.A. (George Peabody).
11. WILSON, ALLEN DITMARS. *Agricultural periodicals in the United States, 1930*, M.A. (Illinois).
12. WOOLSEY, JANETTE. *Norway as depicted in children's books available for American boys and girls*, 1931, M.S. (Columbia).

II, B

(Descriptive Bibliography)

1. CLAUSEN, MALVINA CHARLOTTE. *Chambers' Encyclopaedia: its history and its making from 1859 through 1927*, 1930, M.S. (Columbia).
2. DOUGLAS, ISABEL DOWNING. *The Encyclopedia Americana; an historical study of its rise and development, 1901-1930*, 1930, M.S. (Columbia).

3. FENTON, DOROTHY MAIE. *Biographical dictionaries and directories of English colleges and universities: a study of their importance in biographical research, 1931*, M.S. (Columbia).
4. FLEMING, RUTH. *A Study of the materials for the history of public elementary education in California from 1850 to 1930*, 1932, M.A. (California).
5. GOODING, LYDIA MARIAN. *The Encyclopaedia Britannica; a critical and historical study of the three Constable editions, 1929*, M.S. (Columbia).
6. GOOLD, CLARISSA LOVELAND. *Literary annuals and gift-books; their value in library collections, with a list supplementing F. W. Faxon's Literary annuals and gift-books; a bibliography (1921)*, 1929, M.S. (Columbia).
7. GOULD, CLARA WALTERS HEAVYSEGE. *Recent biography: an analytical study with a view to determining the essential similarities and differences in subject material and treatment in modern biographical writing for adults, young people in the ninth school grade, and children below ninth grade, 1932*, M.S. (Western Reserve).
8. HILBERS, IDA CATHERINE. *A Critical study of the sources of material for a history of Arizona territory, 1863-1912*, 1931, M.A. (California).
9. KJÖNSNESS, NIKOLINE F. *A History of the International Catalogue of Scientific Literature, 1928*, M.S. (Columbia).
10. McCLOY, ELIZABETH JOHNSTON. *Biographical directories of American colleges and universities; their reference value and use in the college, 1928*, M.S. (Columbia.)
11. MATHYS, DELLA MABEL. *A Study of the editions of the work of Sir Walter Scott, 1932*, M.A. (Illinois).
12. MEREDITH, FLORENCE M. *The Encyclopaedia Britannica, history and comparison of the seventh and eighth editions, 1931*, M.S. (Columbia).
13. PATCH, MARION VERNETA. *American insurance journals before 1900: their history and their entries in library catalogs, 1930*, M.S. (Columbia).
14. PHELPS, ROSE BERNICE. *The Encyclopaedia Britannica, ninth edition: a critical and historical study, 1930*, M.S. (Columbia).
15. REED, DORIS MARY. *The Encyclopaedia Britannica—a critical and historical study of the eleventh edition and its relation to the ninth edition, 1931*, M.S. (Columbia).
16. UPTON, ELEANOR STEWART. *A Guide to sources of seventeenth century English history in selected reports of the Royal Commission on historical manuscripts, 1930*, Ph.D. (Chicago).
17. WATTS, BLANCHE VIOLA. *The New International Encyclopaedia; its history and its relation to Chambers' Encyclopaedia, 1929*, M.S. (Columbia).
18. WELLS, DORIS MAUD. *The Ownership and the sales and publication policy of the Encyclopaedia Britannica since the ninth edition, 1929*, M.S. (Columbia).
19. WIECKING, EMMA. *France as depicted in literature for American children; with special reference to nationalism and internationalism, 1928*, M.S. (Columbia).

II, C

(Critical Bibliography)

1. MARTIN, EMMA GEIST. *The Value of "standard" and recommended reference books for high school libraries, as shown by actual use, 1931*, M.S. (Columbia).

II, D

(Printing)

1. BARR, MRS. LOUISE (FARROW). *Presses of northern California, 1900-1930; a study with complete bibliographies of presses which produce finely printed books, 1931*, M.A. (California).
2. CONDIT, LESTER D. *Studies in Roman printing types of the fifteenth century, 1931*, Ph.D. (Chicago).
3. COOLEY, ELIZABETH F. *Vermont imprints before 1800: an introductory essay on the history of printing in Vermont with a list of imprints 1781-1799, 1931*, M.S. (Columbia).
4. HAWKINS, DOROTHY LAWSON. *A Check list of Delaware imprints up to and including 1800; a contribution to the history of printing in Delaware, 1928*, M.S. (Columbia).
5. HUMPHREY, CONSTANCE H. *Check-list of New Jersey imprints to the end of the Revolution, with an introductory essay, 1929*, M.S. (Columbia).
6. MARTIN, MAMIE R. *History of printing in Minnesota to 1866 accompanied by a checklist of Minnesota imprints, 1932*, M.S. (Columbia).
7. METZGER, ETHEL MYRA. *Supplement to Hildeburn's Century of Printing, 1685-1775; with an introductory essay, 1930*, M.S. (Columbia).
8. MORSCH, LUCILE M. *A Checklist of New Jersey imprints 1784-1800; with an introductory essay on the history of printing in New Jersey during this period, 1930*, M.S. (Columbia).
9. NOYES, R. WEBB. *The Development of printing in the district of Maine, with an appended bibliography of Maine imprints to 1820, 1929*, M.S. (Columbia).
10. PROSTOV, EUGENE VICTOR. *Origins of printing in western Russia, 1932*, M.A. (Chicago).
11. WHITTEMORE, CAROLINE. *A Checklist of New Hampshire imprints 1756-1790, with an introductory essay on the history of printing in New Hampshire 1756-1790, 1929*, M.S. (Columbia).
12. WILLOUGHBY, E. E. *William Jaggard and the printing of the first folio edition of Shakespeare, 1932*, Ph.D. (Chicago).
13. WIRICK, HARRIET P. *A Checklist and study of Illinois imprints through 1850, 1932*, M.A. (Illinois).

III, A, 1

(Publication Trends)

1. HARDING, FLORENCE MARIE. *Some important French publishers of the nineteenth century*, 1929, M.A. (Illinois).
2. O'HARRA, DOWNING P. *Book publishing in the United States from 1860-1901, including statistical tables and charts to 1927*, 1928, M.A. (Illinois).
3. UDIN, SOPHIE ADA. *The Book trade under the Soviets and its relationship to higher institutes of learning*, 1929, M.S. (Columbia).

III, F, 2

(History of Libraries)

1. BACKUS, JOYCE. *A History of the San Francisco mercantile library association*, 1931, M.A. (California).
2. BATTLES, FRANCES MILDRED. *An Account of the development of the public library movement in Ohio with special reference to some outstanding libraries*, 1928, M.A. (Illinois).
3. CARROL, FLOY CAROLINE. *School library development in Indiana*, 1929, M.A. (Illinois).
4. CHURCH, FRANCES ELIZABETH. *A Historical survey of the libraries in a group of state normal schools prior to 1900*, 1931, M.S. (Columbia).
5. CROUCH, MARY LOIS. *The Library movement in South Dakota, with special reference to some outstanding libraries*, 1930, M.A. (Illinois).
6. FAYE, CHRISTOPHER URDAHL. *The Writing materials and implements used in early Christian libraries*, 1930, M.A. (Illinois).
7. (KNOER) SISTER MARY MARGARET AGNES. *An Historical survey of libraries of certain Catholic institutions of learning in the United States*, 1930, M.A. (Illinois).
8. KWEI, JOHN CHI BER. *An Historical survey of Chinese libraries*, 1928, M.S. (Columbia).
9. LENFEST, GRACE E. *The Development and present status of the library movement in Nebraska*, 1931, M.A. (Illinois).
10. MC GUIRE, LETHA PEARL. *A Study of the public library movement in Iowa with special reference to certain outstanding and typical libraries*, 1929, M.A. (Illinois).
11. NOURSE, LOUIS M. *A Comparison of the establishment and growth of county libraries in California and New Jersey as influenced by their respective legal, geographical, and administrative differences*, 1931, M.S. (Columbia).
12. PRICHARD, LOUISE GILMAN. *History of the Chicago Public Library*, 1928, M.A. (Illinois).
13. SMITH, DORA. *History of the University of California Library to 1900, 1930*, M.A. (California).

14. THURBER, EVANGELINE. *The Library of the land-grant college, 1862-1900; a preliminary study*, 1928, M.S. (Columbia).
15. WILCOX, LUCILE ELIZABETH. *History of the University of Illinois Library, 1868-1897*, 1931, M.A. (Illinois).
16. YEN, WEN YÜ. *Ssu K'u Ch'uan. "The Four Treasures Library" and its influence upon Chinese culture: an historical and critical study*, 1932, M.S. (Columbia).

III, F, 3

(Library Surveys)

1. FJELD, KOLBJÖRN. *Rural libraries in Norway*, 1930, M.S. (Columbia).
2. LAGRO, GRETA. *An Investigation of library conditions in state accredited high schools of Alabama*, 1932, M.S. (Columbia).
3. NEWTON, CHARLOTTE. *A Survey of Florida high school libraries*, 1929, M.A. (Illinois).
4. SANDY, GERALD HERBERT. *An Account of the national libraries of Spanish South America*, 1932, M.A. (Illinois).
5. WELCH, ELEANOR WEIR. *The Training school library of the state teachers college; need and administration*, 1928, M.S. (Columbia).
6. WONG, WENSAN. *The Municipal reference libraries in the United States of America; a study of their present status, activities, and methods of administration with suggestions for the creation of a municipal reference library at Peking, China*, 1928, M.S. (Columbia).

III, F, 4

(Library Legislation)

1. CRUMPACKER, GRACE F. *Library legislation and the library movement in Kansas*, 1932, M.A. (Illinois).
2. REA, HAZEL. *Studies in Missouri library legislation*, 1929, M.A. (Illinois).

III, F, 5

(Library Finance)

1. FINN, BEATRICE ANNA. *A Survey of the organization and budgets of the libraries of junior colleges under local school control*, 1931, M.S. (Columbia).
2. GROPP, ARTHUR E. *Budgets of county libraries with less than 15,000 volumes*, 1931, M.A. (Illinois).
3. RENSTROM, ARTHUR GEORGE. *Library budgets in the smaller colleges*, 1930, M.S. (Columbia).
4. VANDER PLOEG, JEANNETTE ELIZABETH. *Penal fines as applied to the support of libraries in Michigan*, 1929, M.A. (Illinois).

III, F, 6

(Library Buildings)

1. HOWARD, CLARA ELIZA. *Public library branches in public school buildings*, 1928, M.S. (Columbia).
2. MEMMLER, GERTRUDE ALMA. *Junior college library housing and equipment, programs for institutions of 500 and 1000 students*, 1930, M.A. (California).

III, F, 7

(Library Holdings)

1. FARR, HELEN ESTHER. *Children's literature in teachers colleges and normal schools; some investigations and recommendations*, 1928, M.S. (Columbia).
2. LANCASTER, LUCY LEE. *Do the libraries of land grant colleges provide a representative collection of books for background reading in agricultural literature?* 1931, M.S. (Columbia).
3. RUSSELL, HELEN AUGUSTA. *A Study of the equipment and books in teachers colleges and normal schools giving courses in school librarianship*, 1929, M.S. (Columbia).

III, F, 8

(Library Personnel)

1. ALLEZ, GEORGE C. *A Time study of the activities of the librarians of Wisconsin teachers colleges*, 1932, M.S. (Columbia).
2. ANSTAETT, HERBERT BULOW. *Practice collections for courses in cataloging and related subjects in accredited first-year library schools*, 1932, M.S. (Columbia).
3. CARPENTER, HELEN SUTTON. *The Preparation of a manual for the elementary and junior high school librarians of New York City*, 1930, M.S. (Columbia).
4. COX, FANNIE. *Teaching outlines for biography and periodical indexes and bibliographies for a first year course in reference work*, 1928, M.S. (Columbia).
5. DEVEREAUX, HARRY BRISCOE. *A Study of the circulation per assistant in the New York Public Library system of branches located in the borough of Manhattan*, 1931, M.S. (Columbia).
6. DOYLE, IRENE M. *Library school marks and success in library service*. 1931, M.A. (Illinois).
7. KLYVER, EULIN POMEROY. *A Survey of the activities of city supervisors of school libraries*, 1930, M.S. (Columbia).
8. LOVE, HARRIET. *The problem of discipline in the attainment of objectives in work with children in public libraries*, 1932, M.A. (Western Reserve).
9. PRATT, GLADYS F. *The Contribution of the Commission type of summer library school to professional training*, 1931, M.A. (Illinois).

10. STATHAM, HENRY GRAHAM. *Some aspects of the relation between circulation and size of staff in five branches of the Chicago Public Library, 1929*, M.A. (Illinois).
11. TICHENOR, BARCUS. *A Suggested course of study to train teacher librarians in a state teachers college, 1930*, M.A. (Illinois).
12. WHITCHER, KARA STIRLING. *Student assistance in the high school library; a study of the subject as exemplified in the high schools of the city of New York, 1929*, M.S. (Columbia).

III, F, 9

(Library Practices)

1. BOYLAN, HORTENSE ELAINE. *The Direct mail service department of state library extension agencies, a study of practices and tendencies, 1930*, M.S. (Columbia).
2. GRANNIS, EDITH E. H. *Library records of teacher training institutions including records of books and other materials, finance, staff, and service, 1932*, M.S. (Columbia).
3. HENSHAW, FRANCIS H. *A Scheme of service for public libraries, 1932*, M.S. (Columbia).

III, F, 9a

(Book Selection)

1. COLLIER, AMELIA. *The Book collection in English history for a college library, 1928*, M.S. (Columbia).
2. ELDER, VERA. *Supplementary and illustrative material for English classes as provided by the high school library, 1930*, M.S. (Columbia).
3. FOSTER, ANNA ETHELYN. *Building a book collection in seventeenth century French literature for the college library, 1930*, M.S. (Columbia).
4. HAUSDORFER, WALTER. *The Problem of selecting books and periodicals in zoölogy, 1931*, M.S. (Columbia).
5. LYLE, GUY R. *The Selection of civil engineering journals in the college engineering library, 1932*, M.S. (Columbia).
6. RUSSELL, ABI. *A Fine arts collection for a liberal arts college library, 1931*, M.S. (Columbia).
7. STONE, ERMINE. *A Book collection in the 300's for a junior college library, 1929*, M.S. (Columbia).
8. TASHJIAN, NOUART. *A Book collection in economics for an undergraduate college library, 1930*, M.S. (Columbia).
9. THOMPSON, MYRA FLORENCE. *A Book collection in American history for a junior college library in California, 1930*, M.S. (Columbia).

III, F, 9c

(Cataloguing and Classification)

1. ACHEPOHL, DORIS WILEY. *A Study of the terminology used for professional library literature, with a suggested list of subject headings*, 1932, M.A. (Illinois).
2. AMBUHL, FRANCES IDA. *A Study of the uniform entries used in the Cataloging of sacred books and anonymous classics*, 1928, M.A. (Illinois).
3. BAEHR, WILLIAM OTTO. *A Study of the treatment of religious subjects as set forth in the decimal classification of Melville Dewey*, 1930, M.A. (Illinois).
4. GRAHAM, KATHLEEN. *Index to a librarian's professional shelf*, 1928, M.A. (George Peabody).
5. IBEN, ICKO. *The Classification of zoölogy for libraries; its principles and practice*, 1929, M.A. (Illinois).
6. KWEI, JOHN CHI BER. *Bibliographical and administrative problems arising from the incorporation of Chinese books in American libraries*, 1931, Ph.D. (Chicago).
7. LATSHAW, RUTH NELLE. *A Comparative study of some rules for the alphabetical arrangement of entries in library catalogues*, 1928, M.A. (Illinois).
8. LINGENFELTER, MARY REBECCA. *The Indexing of American educational periodicals during the first three quarters of the nineteenth century*, 1932, M.S. (Columbia).
9. MARTIN, DOROTHY GIFFORD. *A Comparison of corporate entry for societies, institutions and miscellaneous bodies in the catalog codes of the United States and Europe*, 1931, M.A. (Chicago).
10. OLDFATHER, MARGARET. *A Study of author entries for United States government publications based upon Library of Congress cards*, 1932, M.A. (Illinois).
11. TROTIER, ARNOLD HERMAN. *Contemporary educational literature, its place in the Dewey decimal classification*, 1932, M.A. (Illinois).
12. WARRICK, ELVIN SCHUYLER. *A Study of subject headings and of terminology in classification systems for pure mathematics with an attempt to place each subject in the Dewey decimal classification system*, 1932, M.A. (Illinois).

III, F, 9e

(Lending and Circulation)

1. DOWNS, BINGHAM ROBERT. *A Study of the reserve book problem in college libraries*, 1930, M.S. (Columbia).
2. WOOD, EURA EVELYN. *Procedures followed by large public libraries to secure the return of books delinquent in the adult department*, 1931, M.S. (Columbia).

III, F, 9f

(Inter-library Loans)

1. HUTCHINS, MARGARET. *History and practice of inter-library loans in British libraries, with a list of printed aids for the location of books in the British Isles*, 1931, M.S. (Columbia).
2. WINCHELL, CONSTANCE MABEL. *The Problem of locating books in American libraries, a study of methods of procedure and sources of information*, 1930, M.S. (Columbia).

III, F, 9g

(Educational Activities)

1. (BRENNAN) SISTER MARY AURELIUS. *History and influence of the Catholic reading-circle movement*, 1930, M.A. (Illinois).
2. BROOKS, ALICE R. *The Integration of library instruction with the high school social studies*, 1932, M.S. (Columbia).
3. CUNDIFF, RUBY ETHEL. *The Stimulation of cultural reading; a college and university library problem*, 1928, M.S. (Columbia).
4. ETHELL, EMILY. *A Plan for teaching the use of books and libraries in a junior college*, 1932, M.A. (California).
5. KOHLSTEDT, MILDRED. *Readers' advisory service in the college library*, 1931, M.A. (Illinois).
6. SUTHERLAND, WINIFRED A. *Methods used to make the work of the readers' advisory department of the public library known in the community*, 1931, M.S. (Columbia).
7. WILCOX, JEROME K. *The Adult education work of the United States government, with a selected bibliography of the resultant publications*, 1928, M.A. (Illinois).
8. WOODWORTH, RACHEL. *School library publicity in senior high school newspapers*, 1932, M.S. (Columbia).

III, F, 9h

(Extension)

1. BABCOCK, LUCY ANN. *Co-operation of the public library and the school; a survey of current methods*, 1931, M.A. (Illinois).
2. GULLEDGE, JAMES RATLIFF. *The Extension work of land-grant college libraries*, 1932, M.A. (Illinois).
3. McCARTHY, CECILIA MARY. *A Study of certain phases of library extension in the state of Illinois*, 1929, M.A. (Illinois).
4. SULLENS, ELSIE. *The Interrelation of women's clubs and library work with special reference to Oklahoma*, 1930, M.A. (Illinois).

5. WILLIAMS, SARA METELLA. *County library service by contract; a study of rural library extension as provided for in the contract provisions of county library laws of the United States, 1931*, M.A. (Illinois).

III, F, 10a

(Social Influence)

1. BLACK, DOROTHY MILLER. *The Influence of public libraries as revealed through biography and autobiography, 1928*, M.A. (Illinois).

III, F, 10b

(Services to Particular Groups)

1. BOND, EDITH GRACE. *Service to the blind by state libraries, 1932*, M.S. (Columbia).
2. SLAUSON, CELESTE M. *Comparison of the service of the study hall library and the separate library in the junior high school, 1932*, M.S. (Columbia).

III, F, 10c

(Co-operation with Other Agencies)

1. COBB, MARY ELIZABETH. *The Collateral reference function of the teachers college library as affected by the holdings of other local libraries, 1930*, M.A. (Chicago).

IV

(Research)

1. CURTISS, DOROTHY W. *A History of the International Institute of Bibliography, 1932*, M.S. (Columbia).
2. DOOLITTLE, GLADYS MARY. *A History of the "Concilium bibliographicum," Zurich, 1929*, M.S. (Columbia).
3. WINSLOW, AMY. *A Study of data pertinent to the advising of adult readers, 1929*, M.A. (Chicago).

DOUGLAS WAPLES

GRADUATE LIBRARY SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS FOR LIBRARY BRANCHES IN RELATION TO CIRCULATION¹

OBJECTIVES

THE Washington Public Library has recently engaged in a study of personnel requirements for branches in the hope of (1) determining a standard by valid data which should indicate the number of assistants required for a given circulation; (2) discovering the relative time required for the major activities such as reading-room service, circulation, administration, etc.; (3) setting up standards of accomplishment for clerical routine processes to be maintained by individual members of the staff.

Such standards were needed for use before appropriating bodies and for proper allotment of staff to the various agencies. As a branch system expands, it becomes increasingly difficult for the administrator to keep sufficiently in touch with all of the units to determine their relative requirements. Impartial measures would be helpful, although, obviously, judgment should not be based on them alone.

A standard, if once accepted as a general principle by appropriating groups even though not always maintained, would simplify the presentation of estimates for additional personnel and should be especially helpful in the case of established agencies which have outgrown their original forces or staffs. Appropriating groups have a tendency to disregard growth, seeming to think that work can expand indefinitely with a stationary staff, not realizing that there comes a saturation point beyond which the work cannot be carried in justice either to the staff or to the public. It is recognized that an argument which is mathe-

¹ The writer wishes to acknowledge her indebtedness to her assistant, Miss Ernestine Brown; to Miss Helen Cavanagh, administrative assistant; and to Mr. Ralph L. Thompson, librarian of the Mount Pleasant Branch of the Washington Public Library.

matically demonstrable is more effective than one which rests upon opinion.

Ample precedent existed for such a study. Similar standards are customary in business organizations and in educational fields. The Congress of the United States has established a standard for the teaching load for the public schools of Washington.² As early as 1790 the desirability of standards for teaching was recognized by George Washington. He said:

I lay it down as a maxim that if the number of pupils is too great for the tutors, justice cannot be done, be the abilities of the latter what they will. . . . What the due proportion is beyond which it ought not to go is in some measure matter of opinion, but an extreme must be obvious to all.³

The application of this principle to library service is equally warranted. The library is robbed of its opportunity to do work of educational value when too few assistants serve too many persons. On the other hand, justice to the taxpayer requires proper efficiency on the part of the library staff. To determine "the due proportion" has been the purpose of various library studies,⁴ the value of which cannot be discounted. But the conclusions drawn from such investigations have been found somewhat disappointing. In some cases they were negative—that is, the variations between agencies were found so great that data could not be derived from them; in other cases the basis for the standard set up was not given. We could not go with hope of success to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia or to

² "To reduce elementary school classes to a standard of not more than 40 pupils per class" (*Pub. No. 481* [68th Cong.]).

³ *Letters and recollections of George Washington* (Garden City, 1906), p. 24.

⁴ Arthur L. Bailey, "Budget studies," *Library journal*, March 1, 1923, pp. 211-15; Henry G. Statham, "Some aspects of the relation existing between circulation and size of staff in five branches of the Chicago Public Library" (unpublished thesis, University of Illinois Library School, 1929); Harry Devereaux, "Two studies on 'Circulation per assistant,'" *Library journal*, February 15, 1932, pp. 172-76; Axel Walder, "More circulation per assistant, *ibid.*, November 1, 1932, pp. 911-12. The statement furnished by Owen J. Dever, director of Queens Borough Public Library, on April 29, 1931, is also pertinent: "The proposal is to staff branches and other agencies on the basis of one librarian to each 15,000-20,000 volumes of annual circulation. The modification should be applied where reference service requires greater attention." Professor William L. Bailey of Northwestern University "advocates one full-time assistant for every 20,000 circulation" ("A Reply on staff allotment," *Chicago Public Library staff news*, February, 1929, p. 51).

the United States Budget Bureau, before whom our estimates are argued, with a standard unless it rested upon a clearly demonstrable basis.

In Mr. Devereaux's article he says:

But in seeking such a formula, librarians are avowedly demanding a simple answer to a complex problem. Every library presents an individual problem, with variations in clientèle, staff, physical plant, and book stock. The ideal method for allotment of staff assistants must either take each of these variations into consideration or else be so flexible that it can disregard them. Investigators, so far, have assumed the impossibility of including all such variations in a single formula, and have sought a simpler statement based upon a single activity of the library, that single activity being circulation. Circulation is a factor common to all public libraries and so furnishes a better measure than any other for purposes of comparison.⁵

PROCEDURE

In our study we, in common with these other inquirers, are using the circulation per assistant for the standard. We arrived at the standard, however, by breaking down the branch service into its component activities and determining the time required for each. This procedure was followed at the suggestion of Mr. Ralph Bowman of the Federal Personnel Classification Board. It was only later that it was found to be in line with Mr. Devereaux's statement quoted above. In taking the circulation per assistant as the standard it should be understood that each assistant represents a proportionate share of all the activities of the agency exclusive of janitorial service—that is, not only circulation but also attendant clerical detail, shelving of books, administration, reference and advisory work.

The library trustees had already adopted an A, B, C, D classification for branches. This classification was based on population, topographical factors, and proximity to the central library and other branches, present and proposed. The D or subbranches are in small or pocketed districts and are temporary or school branches. They are open thirty-two hours weekly. The B and C branches operate on one floor and maintain one charging desk for adults and children in communities with

⁵ *Loc. cit.*

populations ranging from 25,000 to 75,000 and are open sixty-four hours weekly. The A branches have separate floors for adults and children, serve populous communities, and are regional in character. In this study one branch in each class was used as a type.

A breaking-down of the service into component activities constituted the next step. The service of the branches consists of (1) administrative work including supervision of building, instruction and direction of staff, responsibility for the book collection, ordering of new titles and weeding out old titles, making community contacts, and performing the routine duties of correspondence, money records, statistics, etc.; (2) reading-room or advisory and reference work, including protection of collections and preparation of reading lists and talks to community groups; (3) loan desk; (4) record work; and (5) the care of the book shelves, including shelving of books returned or used by readers in proper classified sequence, and keeping reading-rooms tidy.

After determining these major activities, it was necessary to analyze them comparatively on the basis of the factors which controlled them in the different types of branches. Then, by assigning one unit to each of the factors in the smallest agency, the number of units was worked out proportionately for each activity in each type of branch. Using the results of detailed time studies as a basis for comparison, it was then easy to translate these units into the weekly hours required. The total hours weekly which were necessary, divided by the number of hours of service of each assistant (thirty-nine hours weekly), gave the number of assistants. It should be understood that the resulting figures constitute minimum allowances of time and may have to be revised in the future after practical tests or as new factors enter the picture.

It is necessary at this point to describe the time studies used in arriving at the standard for each type of work. The South-eastern Branch, in the B group, was used as a laboratory as being more nearly typical than the others—it is open the full sixty-four hours; operates only one charging desk, serving both

adults and children; is much used and has a staff adequate to its needs. Records were kept on all activities of the branch from January 16 to 21, 1933, involving an accurate count of all the time of each member of the staff even to five-minute periods. This record was checked with a weekly schedule in operation for a period of two years and with a schedule for two earlier years with a different number of staff members. These time studies were compared with the time required for similar activities in the Mount Pleasant (A branch) children's room, kept for a fairly slow week, December 12-17, 1932, and with similar counts submitted by each of the seven other branches. The time required for the various activities showed close correlation in the different agencies.

Perhaps the following explanation will make Table I clearer. It will be noted that the unit of measurement was based on the smallest agency; for example under administration, if the square footage of the D branch is 2,211, the units for A, B, C branches will be their square footage divided by 2,211 or 3.4, 3.6, and 6.1, respectively. Again, if one unit is assigned to a staff of 4 persons, the units for a staff of 7 will be as many as 4 will go into 7 or 1.7; a staff of 12 will be as many as 4 goes into 12 or 3.0; and a staff of 22 will be as many as 4 goes into 22 or 5.5. This procedure is followed throughout the table to give a picture of the relative demands of branches of different types. In translating the total units into time required, however, the standard of comparison was shifted to the B or Southeastern Branch because of its more typical aspects. All comparisons could have been made on the Southeastern Branch, but to avoid the use of decimals it was thought more convenient to compare the activities on the basis of the smallest branch. To complete the explanation: If the sum of the units representing the activities grouped under "Administration" is 13.6 at the Southeastern Branch and it takes thirty-two hours weekly to perform them, it will take as many hours at the Mount Pleasant Branch as 13.6:32::23.6:x, or 56 hours.

TABLE I
HOURS REQUIRED FOR MAJOR ACTIVITIES
(Figures for B branch used as base)

	A		B		C		D	
	Mt. Pleasant		Southeastern		Takoma Park		Chevy Chase	
		Units		Units		Units		Units
Administration:								
Buildings (square footage).....	13,636	6.1	8,092	3.6	7,835	3.4	2,211	1
Staff.....	22	5.5	12	3	7	1.7	4	1
Book fund (annual).....	\$6,000	6	\$4,000	4	\$2,000	2	\$1,000	1
Reports statistics, etc.		2		1		1		1
Outside contacts.	Regional	4	Smaller community	2	Small pop. but active community	1.5	No equipment for much stimulation	1
Total.....		23.6		13.6		9.6		5
Base (B branch) 32:								
Hours required.....		56		32		22		12
Reading-rooms*								
Hours open.....	128	4	64	2	64	2	32	1
Desks.....	6	6	3	3	2	1	1	1
Total.....		10		5		4		2
Base (B branch) 123:								
Hours required.....		246		123		98		49
Loan desk:								
Hours open.....	128	4	64	2	64	2	32	1
Desks.....	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Registered borrowers.....	23,878	6	11,293	3	5,147	1.3	3,802	1
Circulation.....	390,605	5.1	204,651	2.5	119,281	1.5	76,130	1
Total.....		17.1		8.5		5.8		4
Base (B branch) 115:								
Hours required.....		231		115		78		54

* Reading-room: A - 246 = 2 X 64 + 2 X 59 C - 98 = 64 + 34
 B - 123 = 64 + 59 D - 49 = 32 + 17

TABLE I—Continued

	A		B		C		D	
	Mt. Pleasant		Southeastern		Takoma Park		Chevy Chase	
		Units		Units		Units		Units
Record work: [†]								
Registered bor- rowers.....	23,878	6	11,293	3	5,147	1.3	3,802	1
Circulation.....	390,605	5.1	204,651	2.5	119,281	1.5	76,130	1
Fines and re- serves [‡]	\$4,775	4.7	\$1,590	1.5	\$1,098	1	\$1,004	1
Total.....		15.8		7		3.8		3
Base (B branch) 71:								
Hours required		160		71		39		30
Shelving:								
Book collection..	37,564	6.6	23,958	4.2	13,572	2.3	5,664	1
Circulation.....	390,605	5.1	204,651	2.5	119,281	1.5	76,130	1
Total.....		11.7		6.7		3.8		2
Base (B branch) 49:								
Hours required		86		49		28		15

† Record work was found to be constant to circulation at central library over a period of six to ten years.

‡ Special service required by cardholders indicated by amounts collected for overdue books and re-serves.

TABLE II
SUMMARY OF TOTAL HOURS SHOWING STAFF REQUIRED
AND CIRCULATION PER ASSISTANT

	A		B		C		D	
	Present	Required	Present	Required	Present	Required	Present	Required
Administration.....	37	56	32	32	7	22	2	12
Reading-room.....	206	246	123	123	39	98	32	49
Loan desk.....	258	231	115	115	98	78	41	54
Record work.....	144	160	71	71	24	39	28	30
Shelving.....	96	86	49	49	27	28	14	15
Total.....	741	779	390	390	195	265	117	160
Weekly staff hours	39	39	39	39	39	39	39	39
Staff required.....	19	20	10	10	5	6	3	4
Circulation.....	390,605		204,651		119,281		76,130	
Circulation per as- sistant.....	20,558	19,530	20,465	20,465	23,856	19,713	25,377	19,032

RESULTS

The results of the study seem sound since (1) there is general agreement in the records of the time required for individual duties at the various agencies; (2) it shows the close correlation between the various agencies in the amounts of time required for direct and indirect service to the public; (3) the tables demonstrate that 19,000-20,000 volumes per assistant for all activities of the branch is a fair standard, and this standard agrees with the one adopted by a number of other large library systems; (4) the number of volumes carried in hours assigned to the loan-desk and record work only agrees with the 39,000 volumes per assistant found by Mr. Henry G. Statham to exist in his study of five Chicago Public Library branches.⁶

The following statement and Table III were presented to the Trustees at a recent board meeting and were approved by them. As a result, the standard of 20,000 circulation per person for branches of Types B, C, and D and 19,000 per person for branches of Type A was adopted for this library.

STAFF REQUIREMENTS FOR BRANCHES BASED ON TOTAL CIRCULATION

The following standard of one assistant for each 20,000 volumes circulated for branches of Types B, C, and D and 19,000 for branches of Type A has been derived by a careful study of the factors controlling the service in each type of branch and by time studies for various activities. It is believed that it has been subjected to sufficient checks to be trustworthy.

It should be understood that this standard person represents a proportionate share of all activities of the branch, circulation, clerical detail, administration, and reading-room service, but is exclusive of janitorial work.

There is general agreement among public libraries on a maximum of 20,000 volumes of circulation annually per assistant as a practical figure for ordinary service with a reduction to 15,000 volumes when much advisory and reference service is required. The figure proposed for our branches and arrived at through entirely different methods is close to the maximum in successful operation in other libraries. The conservatism exercised in setting it up may necessitate revision of the standard after practical tests. It has not been found feasible to apply the same schedule to the circulation services of the central library due to segregation of collections in separate reading-rooms, higher specialization, and closed stacks. The classification of branches A, B, C, D,

⁶ *Loc. cit.*

as adopted by the Trustees for the Extension Program,⁷ was based on population, topographical factors, and proximity to central library and other branches, present and proposed.

A circulation of 375,000 is considered an appropriate maximum circulation for any one branch. Before that is reached other properly spaced branches should be established.

When the circulation of any branch of whatever grade drops below the indicated figures the staff should be correspondingly reduced by transfer to a more active branch.

TABLE III

BRANCH D—SUBBRANCH OPEN 32 HOURS A WEEK

(Very little reference and advisory service possible)

Circulation	Staff
Up to 20,000	1 plus evening hour service
20,000-40,000	2 plus evening hour service
40,000-60,000	3
60,000-80,000	4

BRANCH C—ONE-FLOOR BUILDING—OPEN FULL HOURS

(Reference and advisory service required)

Circulation	Staff
80,000-100,000	5
100,000-125,000	6

BRANCH B—ONE-FLOOR BUILDING—OPEN FULL HOURS

(Considerable reference and advisory service required)

Circulation	Staff
120,000-140,000	7
140,000-160,000	8
160,000-180,000	9
180,000-200,000	10
200,000-220,000	11

BRANCH A—TWO-FLOOR BUILDING—OPEN FULL HOURS

(Regional service; large amount of reference and advisory service required)

Circulation	Staff
300,000-324,000	17
324,000-343,000	17
343,000-362,000	18
362,000-381,000	19
381,000-400,000	20
400,000-419,000	21

⁷ Public Library of the District of Columbia, *Extension program, 1932-1946*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1932.

Time requirements for major activities.—The second purpose of the study, it will be remembered, was to "discover the relative time for such phases of the work as reading-room service, circulation, administration, etc." This is especially important in order to make reasonable provision for branch administration and for reading-room service (reference and advisory) and to protect them from the inroads made by the demands of routine processes arising from growing circulation. In times of undue pressure the valuable reference and advisory work is pushed to the wall, leaving the loaning of books as practically the library's sole service. It is difficult to indicate needs in the reference and advisory fields since they may not be reduced to figures. Yet the personal assistance to readers must be maintained if the taxpayer is to get any adequate return on his investment in the library. This is particularly true in times of stress such as the present, when the library is crowded with persons who are not ordinarily readers and who need the maximum of individual help. Though not quite so pressing a matter, perhaps, as provision for the reading-room service, any schedule which does not permit adequate time for administrative work limits the ultimate proper growth of the branch inasmuch as it does not allow for perspective, adequate staff training, and appropriate community contacts. It may be difficult to maintain at all times the required provision for reading-room service and administrative work, but at least the figures discovered in the table show the chief librarian what he should strive for and give a clearer picture of a suitable branch organization.

Table IV indicates the percentage of time for each branch activity and the percentage of their combined time for direct and indirect service to the public. By direct service is meant loan-desk and reference and advisory service; by indirect, administration, record work, and shelving. The figures indicate that approximately two-thirds of the total time is given to direct and one-third to indirect service.

Standards of achievement.—Third, we wished to set up standards of achievement. We have no desire to turn the library into a factory or to place upon the staff strain additional to that in-

herent in public service. We felt, however, that reasonable standards based on figures of day-in and day-out work, not those obtained under the pressure of making a record, would be a satisfaction to the assistant and give us a sound position before economy boards. Accordingly, the following standards are before us tentatively. After experimentation they may require further revision.

TABLE IV
PERCENTAGE OF TIME GIVEN TO ACTIVITIES

	A		B		C		D	
	Present	Re- quired	Present	Re- quired	Present	Re- quired	Present	Re- quired
Administration.....	5	7.2	8.2	8.2	3.6	8.3	1.7	8
Reading-room service.....	27.8	31.6	31.6	31.6	20	37	27.3	30.5
Loan desk.....	34.8	29.6	29.5	29.5	50.3	29.4	35	33.5
Record work.....	19.4	20.5	18.2	18.2	12.3	14.7	24	18.7
Shelving.....	13	11.1	12.5	12.5	13.8	10.6	12	9.3
Total.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Direct service to public.....	62.6	61.2	61.1	61.1	70.3	66.4	62.3	64
Indirect service to public.....	37.4	38.8	38.9	38.9	29.7	33.6	37.3	36

STANDARDS FOR CLERICAL ROUTINE PROCESSES

- Record work..... One hour for each 50 volumes circulated
- Filing circulation..... Filing by Cutter classification and counting circulation by classes—500 volumes an hour
- Registration records..... 10.8 an hour; includes completing forms and filing changes of address, lost-cards records, and withdrawals
- Overdue work..... 11 notifications to borrowers per hour, listing from one to a number of titles; includes searching for books on shelves and preparation of two notices
- Messenger work..... Owing to the variations in the difficulty of the cases, no average can be maintained
- Reserve work..... 12 reserves, including branch exchange per hour; involves searching for books on shelves and in files and completing and mailing notifications

Carding books at return desk . .	180 volumes per hour; includes fanning books to discover mutilations and repairs needed
Shelving.....	85 volumes an hour; includes revising shelves, filing books returned or used by borrowers, and keeping reading-rooms in order

Costs of branch service.—Lastly we were concerned with costs. Although we are firmly convinced that a high quality of library service must not be sacrificed, since it is that which makes the library of real social value to the community, yet every effort

TABLE V
COSTS OF TYPICAL BRANCHES

	A	B	C	D
Salaries*.....	\$ 31,020	\$ 16,220	\$ 9,140	\$ 6,120
Books and periodicals.....	6,000	4,000	2,000	1,000
Binding.....	2,900	2,400	1,740	500
Maintenance.....	3,210	1,715	1,150	250
Rent.....				2,400
Total.....	\$ 43,130	\$ 24,335	\$ 14,030	\$ 10,270
Overhead†.....	12,499	6,548	3,817	2,436
Total.....	\$ 55,579	\$ 30,883	\$ 17,847	\$ 12,706
Circulation.....	390,605	204,651	119,281	76,130
Unit cost per volume circulated.....	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.16

* Basic salaries, exclusive of longevity increments which fluctuate from time to time.

† The cost of overhead for the branches is based on salaries of administration, acquisitions, catalogue and binding offices. It does not include cost of supplies or maintenance of central library or of annex where acquisitions, catalogue, and binding offices are temporarily housed.

must be made to keep the costs down. We have accordingly centralized technical processes as far as possible; we have studied all routine records for eliminations and short-cuts; we are using forms and mechanical devices whenever possible; we are meeting rush hours by half-time desk assistants; and we are economizing in electricity and in supplies and equipment. Table V presents costs for the various types of branches. This shows the unit cost per volume circulated as ranging from 14 to 16 cents. Since the average for all libraries in the table prepared by Mr. Judson T. Jennings of Seattle based on the "Comparative statistics of libraries in 41 cities of more than 200,000 popu-

lation," figures based on those published by the American Library Association for the year 1931, was 15.3 cents,⁸ it would seem that the costs for the branches in accordance with the proposed organization are not unreasonable.

The cost per volume circulated for the library system (actual figures including longevity increments) for the year was 17.8 cents (exclusive of \$60,000 for extraordinary expenses in connection with new branches). This excess of cost over comparable library systems is due to an inadequate number of branches, an unusually good salary scale, and the development of the advisory service upon the divisional plan. As the number of branches increase the costs will be reduced.

We do not claim that our findings are applicable to other libraries, but simply that the general procedure may be suggestive for arriving at figures to meet local conditions. We believe that such a study clarifies administrative problems and affords a basis for meeting the exactions of economy and at the same time helps to protect the essential educational service of the library at a period when need for it is greatest and provision for it most difficult to maintain.

CLARA W. HERBERT

PUBLIC LIBRARY
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

⁸ Photostat tables.

THE CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

CLARA W. HERBERT was born in Southwick, Massachusetts, in 1876. She attended Vassar College from 1894 to 1896 and then received her professional training in the apprentice class of the Brooklyn Public Library and at the Carnegie Library School in Pittsburgh (1904). Miss Herbert was branch children's librarian of the Brooklyn Public Library, going from there to the Public Library of the District of Columbia where she successively was the director of work with children, director of the training class, and assistant librarian, her present position. Miss Herbert is also chairman of the American Library Association committee on co-operation with the national congress of parents and teachers.

AUGUSTUS FREDERICK KUHLMAN: for biographical information see the *Library quarterly*, III (1933), 95.

JOHN MALCOLM MITCHELL, C.B.E., M.C., M.A., LL.D., was born in Nottingham, England, in 1879. He received his formal education at Liverpool College and at Queens College, Oxford. Colonel Mitchell's particular interest was in the classics, an interest which gave him the position of assistant editor in classics, archaeology, and ancient history of the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and of lecturer in classics at the University of London from 1909 to 1914 and again in 1919. The intervening war period found him in active service, his military ranking at the present time being that of lieutenant colonel in the Regular Army Reserve of Officers. Since 1923 Colonel Mitchell has been a member of the adult education and public library committees of the Board of Education. He was president of the Library Association in 1931-32 and now is secretary of the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust. His publications include *Grote's history of Greece 600-403 B.C.* (with M. Caspari, 1907), *The New army in the making* (1915), *Lectures on logic* (1919), editor of the *Rural libraries handbook* (1922), and *Public library system of Great Britain* (1924).

DOUGLAS WAPLES: for biographical information see the *Library quarterly*, I (1931), 90.

CHARLES K. A. WANG is a native Chinese, having been born in China in 1902. He received his A.B. degree from Furman University in 1924, going from there to the University of Chicago where he received a

Master's degree in education. In 1931 he was awarded his Ph.D. in psychology from the same institution. Mr. Wang is at present teaching at Honan University in Kaifeng, China.

THE COVER DESIGN

ANTONIUS DE ZANCHIS, whose mark is reproduced on the cover, a native of Alazono near Bergamo, exercised his craft as a stationer at Venice from 1496 to 1505 or 1506. Although between September, 1496, and December, 1498, six books which he issued bear in their colophons his name as printer, there is some doubt as to whether he ever maintained a press. During the latter part of his career, at any rate, he seems to have devoted himself exclusively to publishing.

Antonius de Zanchis specialized in liturgical works. He was probably the "Antonio de Zanot" who on May 20, 1497, and on January 11, 1498, applied for the privilege of publishing service books and a few classes of secular works. The typographical quality of these service books varied considerably. The woodcuts as a rule were mediocre, but sometimes, as in the fine engraving of St. Michael overcoming the Serpent by a master who signed himself "B.M." in the *Missale Ordinis Camaldulensis* of January 13, 1503, the artistic quality is surprisingly high.

Of the later life of this stationer nothing seems to be known. We have been unable to find any support for the tentative statement of Kristeller that he migrated to Mantua about 1512.

The mark is in the form of a castle, flying a scroll inscribed, "Antonio Zanco," the vernacular form of the name of the stationer.

EDWIN ELIOTT WILLOUGHBY

COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

REVIEWS

The Prison library handbook. By EDITH KATHLEEN JONES *et al.* Prepared for the committee on libraries in correctional institutions of the American Library Association and the committee on education of the American Prison Association. Chicago: American Library Association, 1932. Pp. 181. \$1.50.

This excellent summary of library practice and technique is a distinct achievement. Though intended primarily for the untrained person in charge of the prison library, so successful is its adaptation of professional standards that it might well be used by all untrained persons engaged in library work. The authors, E. Kathleen Jones, John Chancellor, Perrie Jones, and Roland Mulhauser, leaders in institution library work, have had extensive experience in organizing and administering prison libraries and in promoting good reading among prison inmates. In the preparation of this handbook they have had the advice and assistance of Austin H. MacCormick, assistant director of the United States Bureau of Prisons and author of *The Education of adult prisoners*.

A preliminary chapter states the general problems and needs of the prison library, or for that matter of any library. This is followed by a clear explanation of the following aspects of library service: book selection and buying; preparing books for circulation; circulation records and statistics; bringing the library to the reader; reading guidance and reference work; library service to special groups, such as the foreign-born and the native-born illiterate; periodicals, documents, and pamphlet material; the binding and repair of books. Three of the four appendixes at the end of the volume give in convenient form annotated lists of book-reviewing periodicals and book-selection aids, inexpensive editions and series, and the names and addresses of important publishers, book-dealers, and magazine-subscription agencies. The fourth appendix is a simplified Dewey classification for prison libraries. The volume contains an adequate index, and there are references in each chapter suggesting material for further study. No lists of books recommended for the prison library are given, but recently the same committees have issued a pamphlet, *2500 books for the prison library*, compiled by Perrie Jones. This, with the study by Mr. MacCormick, and the book under consideration, comprise an equipment invaluable to the institution librarian.

As an illustration of the simplicity and clarity of presentation of technical processes, the chapters on "Preparing books for circulation" may be cited. The Dewey decimal system of classification is explained, and changes that have been found workable in institution libraries are suggested. The explana-

tion of the Cutter-Sanborn author tables is particularly helpful. The section on cataloguing is brief and practical, giving general principles and essential information without confusing the beginner with details that can be obtained elsewhere. References to more complete treatments are provided. The directions for cataloguing include simple forms ordinarily used in small libraries and are abundantly illustrated with transcripts of sample cards. To aid in the difficult problem of subject cataloguing the Sears's *List of subject headings for small libraries* is explained and detailed directions are given for its use, checking, and adaptation to the special needs of the individual library. So little is available to help the inexperienced librarian in the selection of subject headings that these instructions fill a very real need.

Though the discussion of technical processes occupies a large part of the book, these are represented as merely contributing to the final aim of all library work, namely, intelligent service to readers. Two chapters are devoted entirely to methods of guiding the reader's interests, and frequent references to the reader as the *raison d'être* of all library work occur in every chapter. The gradual and steady building-up of good reading habits through satisfying service rather than through sporadic publicity and "excessive boomerang" of the library is recommended. Principles underlying all satisfactory readers' advisory service are summarized and ways of stimulating the casual reader and of developing habits of consecutive reading are suggested.

Although this handbook is intended merely as a simple presentation of essential library methods, it is also a vitalizing interpretation of the spirit of librarianship, one which other authors and editors would do well to keep in view.

MIRIAM DOWNING TOMPKINS

EMORY UNIVERSITY

Radio and education 1932: proceedings of the second annual assembly of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education, Inc., 1932. Edited by LEVERING TYSON. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932. Pp. viii + 306. \$3.00.

"Radio and education II," as this second volume of the yearly proceedings of the National Advisory Council on Radio in Education assemblies might be called, is valuable for two reasons. First, the report of the director and the reports of the committees are of real interest and informative worth. The committee reports of Morley, Bingham, and Leonard Miller deal with actual experiences in broadcasting educational programs over a period of time. Anyone interested in giving radio talks, or in organizing a series of educational broadcasts, cannot help but gain much useful information from these reports. Second, the proceedings contain some excellent papers discussing various phases of education by radio. To point out two which are of this nature, I mention Hard's "Broadcasting abroad," and Jansky's treatment of "The

Problem of the institutionally owned station." The former is an inimitable exposition of political censorship of radio in Europe as contrasted with open discussion of political topics over the radio in our own country. The latter is a sane and seasoned setting-forth of the difficulties facing educational radio stations.

On the other hand, some of the papers will not, I am afraid, have much interest for the educator whose chief concern is to obtain practical information on how to attain the goal of "showmanship" which has been set up as the basic necessity of broadcasting. With the exception of Mr. Bowman, the speakers on radio advertising from the broadcasting standpoint were content to glorify the medium rather than furnish concrete details.

Since this volume contains the proceedings of a meeting and the discussion of the papers is printed with them, it is to be regretted that there was not more discussion to include than is found in *Radio and education, 1932*. Some of the questions raised in the papers were undoubtedly of general interest, and discussion would have served to clarify them and set forth the other side of each problem presented.

F. H. LUMLEY

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

Repertori bibliografici nazionali. By OLGA PINTO. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1931, Pp. 58. L. 50.

This is a selective list of national bibliographies and works of similar use (about 270 titles in all), and attempts so far as possible, to bring together enough, and only enough, national lists for each country to form an uninterrupted sequence from the beginnings of printing down to date, "perchè ne sia riportata possibilmente l'intiere produzione nazionale." The compiling of the "entire national production" would, of course, require more than a selection of source lists even in cases where they do form a sequence; and, particularly for countries less fully provided with bibliographies, we should need more than such occasional bibliographical dictionaries and literary histories as are included here. However, this list has the advantage over Peddie's *National bibliographies* (1912) and the New York State Library School's *Selected national bibliographies* (1915) of being more up to date, though it omits some important titles listed in these, as well as more recent titles such as Pollard and Redgrave's *Short-title catalogue of books printed . . . 1475-1640* (1926), Whitaker's *Cumulative book list* (1924—), the National Library (Dublin) *List of publications deposited* (1930—), etc. The 1931 edition of the *Index Bibliographicus* presumably appeared too late for inclusion in Pinto's sources (p. 5), and a note tells us that the latest edition of Schneider's *Handbuch der Bibliographie* (1930) was not yet available.

A list like this is always useful, particularly when the titles are so conveniently arranged, and so clearly and succinctly described. The format of a re-

print from *La Bibliofilia* is a little "oversize," but to have the list available in reprint is sufficient matter for gratitude to author and publisher.

HENRY BARTLETT VAN HOESEN

BROWN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Recent social trends in the United States: report of the President's Research Committee on Social Trends. New York and London: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1933. 2 vols. \$10.

Most librarians have been reading competent reviews of *Recent social trends in the United States* ever since it appeared. Many who will see this page have doubtless read the first chapter, examined one or two others of major interest, and leafed through the rest of the volumes. To all such, another description of the content will be of small interest.

Thus instead of reviewing the book in the conventional way, it may be better to concentrate upon certain implications for the public library that have not been noted in previous reviews. In fact, the kaleidoscopic patterns of interweaving social trends are so plainly traced, the judgments upon the social values of many different institutions which influence the trends are so sound, and the perspective of institutional development throughout the thirty-year period is so clear that any social service institution like the library has much to learn by comparing itself with the institutions of several different types that are intelligently criticized in the report.

In short, we propose to compare the library, which is not directly examined as an institution having important influences upon social trends, with other institutions that are so examined. Any points of difference we may establish should help to clarify the social status of the library in the years ahead. Before proceeding farther in this attempt, we should note that we pay the book the supreme compliment of well-nigh perfect confidence, in using it thus to discover valid social objectives for our profession. The Moslem shows no larger faith in the Koran. Does *Recent social trends* deserve such confidence?

Several left-wing journals of different complexions have called the report a scholarly evasion of the economic plagues now ravaging the body politic. Perhaps as many right-wing journals have blamed it for emphasizing the instabilities of our present social structure and for irreverence to the gods of American industry—witness the somewhat ungracious Foreword by President Hoover himself. Between the two stand the rest of us in substantial agreement with John Dewey who says, in the *International journal of ethics*:

I have seen criticisms of these volumes on the ground that they are timid in proposing specific changes and reforms, and backward in setting forth a comprehensive social philosophy from whose standpoint the whole situation should be surveyed. I do not agree with the criticisms. I believe the enduring influence of the report will be increased by its reserves in these two respects. I think that in the long run the interests which those who make the criticisms have at heart will be best served by the style of treatment

adopted. I have often been impatient with methods of mere "fact-finding" used by so-called social and political science. But in these volumes we have something more than mere fact-finding. The facts are presented—sometimes only implicitly, sometimes explicitly—so as to make problems stand out, and that, in my judgment, is the proper function of statement of facts. Hence the volumes are an arsenal. And I would rather have an arsenal of authoritative knowledge than such a premature firing-off of guns as would make a lot of noise and emit great amounts of smoke.¹

One could scarcely expect an editorial committee composed of fallible human beings to come any closer to the dead center of the target. There is a large difference between a controversial book which most reviewers for the same reasons concede to be partly good and partly bad, and another which about half of the critics condemn for the same qualities that the other half approve. *Recent social trends* meets the second description. From this fact, in connection with the quality of brains represented by the staff as a whole, we conclude that it is surprisingly free from minority bias.

Such attention as the report has already received from the library profession has emphasized the infrequency with which the library as such is noticed in the various chapters. In the *Bulletin of the American Library Association*, especially the April, 1933, issue, pages 84 f., the article by G. F. Bowerman in the *Library journal* for March 15, 1933, and other published items, the writers all complain that the library has received too little space. While such complaints are irrelevant to the purposes of the President's investigation, they do imply a lively professional interest in the distinction between the institutions chosen by the committee for intensive study and the institutions not so chosen.

Theoretically, the committee directing the study of social trends had the choice of four decisions regarding the library: (1) to regard it as an institution of sufficient social importance to justify the emphasis given the public schools, the church, the courts, and others of like nature; (2) to treat it as one of several agencies contributing to important social processes like education, recreation, communication, commerce, and the arts; (3) to utilize its records of book circulation as a source of data on the wide variety of trends that find expression in reading behavior (instead of which Hornell Hart in chapter viii uses the files of current periodicals to describe changes in social attitudes and interests); or (4) to recognize the library's social influence only by the implication that it assists certain individuals to accomplish their own social purposes more effectively, along with laboratories, museums, and other depositories. From the professional comments referred to, from the letter² by Wesley Mitchell, chairman of the research committee, and from a careful reading of the volumes, the last procedure appears to have been followed. We may properly ask, why not one of the others?

A sufficient reason in each case is that the committee had no other choice, simply because too little is known about the social implications of the public

¹ XLIII (April, 1933), 344.

² *Bulletin of the American Library Association*, April, 1933, pp. 84 f.

library. Unlike older institutions in this respect, the public library has to date been too busy with administrative problems to collect and organize the facts required to describe the nature, scope, and influence of library activities in terms sufficiently quantitative to serve the purposes of this particular study.

However useless such data may be to the library administrator, it is unfortunate that they were not available for study by this particular group of social scientists. Had they been available, the profession might have expected a criticism of its social policies, comparable to that received by the other institutions examined, a criticism rendered particularly valuable by the plotting of all such institutions on much the same scale of social values. It is this stimulus to the planned co-operation of various institutions which constitutes one of the most valuable by-products of the report.

If evidence were at hand concerning the specific community enterprises of public libraries of different types, the report might well have evaluated them in the light of the complete findings, thereby revealing whatever errors in emphasis might be due to professional blind-spots. In this case we should have had an analysis of the library as a distinctive social institution—its achievements in respect to growth of circulation, holdings, and local prestige, its limitations in respect to the proportion of the adult community reached, the quality of the reading matter it circulates most widely, and perhaps others of equal importance.

For the public library to have formulated a platform in terms of definite social purposes and corresponding activities is, of course, too much to expect, since the American public library as a distinctive social institution is too young and too much the child of the transitional cultural stages which produced it to have developed any substantial body of critical theory. Hence its theory is not comparable to that of institutions which have persisted through many such stages and learned their points of strength and weakness by repeated efforts at adjustment to the changing values of many generations.

We thus fall back upon the second possibility, that is, to treat the public library neither as a separate institution nor as a social process in itself, but as an important influence upon other institutions and processes. While this procedure is more practicable than the first, it is also beyond reach at the present time. For example, the profession is rightly persuaded that libraries render indispensable service to the cause of public education, to mention but one social process. Yet when sought by students either in or outside the profession, tangible descriptions of the service are not to be found. It may be questioned whether any one public library has counted the number of its card-holders who are enrolled in elementary schools, junior high schools, senior high schools, and colleges, and determined the average number of fiction and non-fiction loans to each group per year. If such data were recorded, they would barely serve to define the problem for systematic attack. Before a satisfactory analysis becomes feasible, one would require at least the number of loans in each of many restricted classes of literature, to students of each sex, grade, and curriculum.

There is nothing to be gained by making this example appear more complicated than necessary. Our illustration accordingly errs on the side of simplicity. None the less it may support our apology for the committee's inattention to the library in *Recent social trends* when one remembers that to have described the library as objectively as, for example, "the family" is described, the investigator would have needed comparable and reliable data on loans to corresponding social groups, of different classes of literature, from a fair sample of libraries of typical sizes, and covering the period from 1900 to 1930.

The notion that the public library may some day be able to describe itself in such terms is either stimulating or preposterous, depending upon one's point of view and the nature of his professional loyalties. To persons like the staff of *Recent social trends* it would appear natural for the library profession to take an interest in such evidence of social trends as it might readily accumulate, whether it serves any other useful purpose or not. That the profession does take a large interest in such matters is evident from the profession's interest in the report. That the evidence is not at hand may be inferred from the fact that the committee did not utilize library records as a source of evidence. It would thus be helpful for library schools, and others free to concentrate upon it, to organize the routine collection of such sociological data, for example, as are systematically recorded for administrative use by certain European libraries.

But most helpful of all, it would seem, would be a healthy growth in the feeling of importance now attached to the recording of additional facts about library services. Several types of information, not generally recorded by libraries, are prerequisite to a substantial theory of public librarianship. Our present lack of such information is adequately explained by the librarian's preoccupation to date with more urgent problems of administration. But the doctors hesitate to diagnose an inarticulate patient. Until we have records capable of analysis by methods of social research, we must lose the benefits resulting from intelligent criticism of the public library's social platform, upon which its prosperity must ultimately depend.

DOUGLAS WAPLES

GRADUATE LIBRARY SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The University libraries. By M. LLEWELLYN RANEY. ("University of Chicago Survey," Vol. VII.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933. Pp. xv+250. \$30 a set of twelve.

The literature of university libraries is a bit thin. Physically the American university library has been reborn during this generation and its book collections multiplied many fold. More important still, its central place in the ascertaining and the diffusion of knowledge has been widely recognized. Yet we have only two books of any considerable value in this field, *College and university*

library problems, by George M. Works, and "The Library" (in *Survey of land-grant colleges and universities*), by Charles H. Brown, both studies of the survey type and covering many libraries. Students of the problems of a university library have had to have recourse to librarians' reports, wherein these otherwise rather inarticulate officers have told of their hopes and their plans, more rarely of their failures, in their own particular institutions. Notable among these reports in recent years have been the highly individual annual emanations from the University of Chicago libraries, vivid reflections of the changes being effected there and of the personality of their author. Many will welcome now the opportunity to look at the picture of these libraries as a whole, even if some parts of the canvas are still a bit faint, perhaps waiting a further supply of oils to add detail. This is particularly pertinent in reference to building plans.

This study of a particular library system breaks naturally into two parts: the organization of the libraries and the collections, the latter again divided into those of a departmental and those of a general character. The administrative section, less than forty pages, or a sixth of the book, deals with the highly complicated administrative and physical problem of this very distinctive system. It must be read with some knowledge of the peculiar history of these libraries to understand the elation of the director in recording in some cases accomplishments which merely bring about procedures that have long been in effect elsewhere — the merging of classification and subject-heading work in cataloguing, the reduction in cataloguing costs, the elimination of the accession book. More interesting and significant are the hints of the eventual entire separation of the college, that is, Freshman and Sophomore, library services from those of the upper-class, graduate students, and the faculty. In the interest of both groups in large and complicated institutions, this question must be faced, and it may well be that physical separation of service either in or out of the main university library building may be the solution. Chicago seems to be working in this direction. Highly interesting, too, in the reorganization is the still largely paper plan of putting the administration on a functional and subject basis. Everything having to do with the accession and recording of materials will be under one head, the supervisor of preparation processes. This takes care of order and catalogue departments. Other important officers will be in charge of public services, one each in the distinct fields of the social sciences, the biological and physical sciences, and the humanities. Apparently knowledge of the subject field will be the prime consideration in their selection, but may we not hope that as such librarians come into existence wherever the size of the organization justifies, some consideration will be given to the desirability of knowledge of both subject field and librarianship? From personal experience I know it will be easy to recruit excellent young doctors of philosophy to special service of this kind, and they will be quite willing to add some technical equipment to their subject interest and knowledge, naturally

emphasizing bibliography in their study of librarianship. I see no evidence of desire on Dr. Raney's part for such a combination.

The chapters dealing with the departmental collections, the physical sciences, biological sciences, social sciences, humanities, and the professional schools are in the main concerned with the present status of the printed materials for each field in the University of Chicago and with the program necessary to raise it to an ideal still possible of accomplishment. Here the university librarian and other officers concerned with building up the book collection will certainly read with interest of the methods and tools used in establishing standards and needs. To my knowledge, such material is nowhere else in print. Comment on this very valuable section cannot be complete without reference to the ecstatic, almost lyrical, introduction to each subject. Naturally I turned to the chapter dealing with the graduate library school, eagerly seeking in a hoped-for passage on our professional aims the spiritual uplift a library-school director needs rather badly in these days of unemployment, but I searched in vain for the accustomed rhapsody.

The general chapters dealing with the university's collections, and especially its needs in manuscripts, serials, government documents, newspapers, maps, and fugitive materials, treat these matters in such a broad and fundamental way that they will probably prove by far the most important part of this book for the university librarian. That on government documents by the associate director, A. F. Kuhlman, should be made required reading not only for university librarians but for professors in the social sciences and in other fields covered by such publications.

Throughout this vigorous study breathe the broad conceptions characteristic of Chicago and a spirit of co-operation rather than competition with other libraries in that area. In the summary of needs which concludes this most interesting and exciting survey a modest capital (not annual) budget of about six and a quarter million dollars is suggested. If this seems a fearsome figure for scholarship, let timid souls compare it with the annual expenditure for chewing gum, another Chicago product.

SYDNEY B. MITCHELL

SCHOOL OF LIBRARIANSHIP
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

When a great university undertakes a self-survey, it is a matter of national concern in the realm of higher education. Each of the twelve volumes of the University of Chicago Survey is expected to furnish a critical commentary upon some phase of university life and its multiple problems. The comments upon local conditions are considered rather to be comments upon national educational trends since they reflect current opinion concerning organization and methods. The University of Chicago, if not a typical American university, is a very influential one. It has a tradition of experimentation developed

through the years when it has fostered research in all departments of knowledge. Its contributions to the advancement of learning have been numerous. During the last three years it has been taking stock, examining its organization and methods, in an effort to correct errors and make plans for the future. The reports of its findings are looked to for guidance in determining aims, methods, and achievements by other institutions of higher learning, inasmuch as the problems considered are not peculiar to one institution and the recommendations may be equally applicable to other universities.

The investigation of the library was conducted by Mr. Raney, director of University Libraries, University of Chicago. He was assisted by the members of his staff and by some two hundred members of the University faculties. The report was written in large part by Mr. Raney, although Mr. Kuhlman, associate director, contributed some of the chapters. It describes in detail the present conditions and the future needs of the library. The aim of the study is well described in chapter i, from which the following paragraphs are quoted:

The survey of the library, therefore, consisted in ascertaining (1) the Faculty purposes, and (2) the library fitness to the attainment of those purposes. Accordingly, four leading questions were asked the staff of each department and school: (1) What is your goal? (2) What is the prime library equipment needed to reach that goal? (3) What is the present accountrement? (4) What would be the cost, in arrears and by the year?

The answer to the first question might be abstract—in philosophic terms, or concrete—in terms of preferred research and teaching, or both. The answer to the second mainly involved source material. The third meant checking; the fourth, a budget.

The report is divided into four sections: "The Organization of the libraries," "The Collection, departmental," "The Collection, general," "Conclusions, with a summary of needs." Of particular interest is Part I, and especially those pages which are factual rather than rhetorical. There is a careful and detailed description of the reorganization which has been taking place in the libraries of the University during the last four years with diagrams which show the former organization and the present grouping of departments and assignment of work. The library cabinet, when completed, will consist of the heads of the seven sections into which the work of the library has been divided, each section chief to be an expert in the field assigned to him.

The effect upon the library of the changes in curriculum and teaching methods instituted recently in that University are described briefly. A more detailed account is given of the reduction in the cost of cataloguing per volume and of the changes in cataloguing processes. The cataloguing costs here described include the cost of printing the cards as well as of the preparation of copy. It would have been of more value to the profession if the two had been separated as only a very few libraries duplicate their cards by the printing process, while costs of preparing copy are comparable.

Nearly three-quarters of the report deal with the present conditions and specific needs of the various schools for pursuing their subjects of study and research. A master-list of periodical titles was compiled and each department

checked it. Special bibliographies were also checked. In each case the book needs and the periodical needs were recorded separately. Only the largest libraries in the country at present rival the collections of the University of Chicago. If its resources are only about 50 per cent of the desirable amount, many librarians will scarcely venture to evaluate their collections. It is to be regretted that there is so little discussion of the proposals for housing such an accumulation of books as is anticipated by the Survey. The shelf facilities of the libraries are already overtaxed. With an annual increase at the present time requiring a mile and a half of shelving, it is suggested that at least two hundred miles of shelving must be anticipated.

Table 17 is entitled "Financial implications of the Survey." It groups the various subjects into divisions and then indicates the number of volumes in which the division is in arrears, the cost as estimated to bring each group up to date, the present annual appropriation for each division, and the appropriation which will be needed to maintain it at the proposed level. The present annual budget for books and periodicals would have to be doubled, while the salary budget would need to be increased by a little more than one-quarter. The necessity for extensive collections of periodicals and documents is emphasized repeatedly. Such publications are considered of the greatest importance for research purposes and their acquisition is urged as a first consideration in the future development of the library.

The departmental studies are not uniform. In some instances they are very detailed and exact, showing much research, while in others the requirements are stated in more general terms. On the whole, the work seems to have been carried on conscientiously. All may not agree as to the urgency of the needs expressed or as to the methods implied in the organization of the library, but such a study is suggestive and will be of much more than local import.

F. L. D. GOODRICH

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

After reading this volume of "The University of Chicago survey," the feelings of the reviewer were rather mixed. It is an incongruous production. There is much intimate detail which concerns the University of Chicago alone and is of no interest to the outsider—such as figures and statistics of the needs of the different departments and subdivisions of departments. If this is meant as bait for donors, one can only wish the University of Chicago "happy hunting"—but the details make dull reading, even though they are dressed up in the grand manner.

Associated with these statistics is matter of a very different sort: a series of "remarks" characterizing each department of instruction and its place in the educational scheme. These are of value and interest and might well be separately published in pamphlet form as a critique of the college curriculum. But again there is a certain degree of incongruity. Some of the departments

describe their aims quite sanely and soberly: for instance, what could be clearer than this? (p. 125), "The Romance Department is chiefly concerned with the languages, literatures, and civilization of France, Italy, and Spain, as developed over a thousand years. All three of these nations have played leading rôles in history and have profoundly affected our culture." Very much to the point!

But turn now to page 108 and read Philosophy's "blurb": "When the scales balance, Philosophy presides, whatever ensues, but it is poise not paralysis, with joy in the poise. In every thinking step equilibrium necessary to progress is assured by the compulsion of her Logic. Conduct is kept sane by the sternness of her Ethics. Exploration curves home in obedience to Metaphysics, while it is from Aesthetics, her mast-head, that imagination takes flight, and there that she tethers in storm. What is the idea?" (It is not fair, of course, to break off a quotation in the middle, but the opportunity is too good to miss: What *is* the idea?) And music (p. 111): "Sound is a mode of motion, and a slow mode at that. But, firmly astride the metaphor of music, the University may enter its fifth decade nearer in a flash to reality than a count of vibrations ever could bring it." I have a hunch that the University is astride something firmer than the metaphor of music.

So the reviewer is left a bit dazed. Sober on the whole, the library survey is somewhat intoxicated in spots. As for the information contained in the survey, I repeat that it has little to offer anyone outside the University of Chicago. To know that at Chicago the Department of Comparative Religion, for instance, calls for a budget of \$7,000 per year contributes nothing to the solution of one's problems at another institution. Only if taken as a whole, perhaps, in all its volumes, does the "Survey" throw light on the problem of education in general. The programs of individual departments are a matter of local interest only.

DEAN P. LOCKWOOD

HAVERFORD COLLEGE

Internationale Bibliographie des Zeitungswesens. By KARL BÖMER.
("Sammlung bibliothekswissenschaftlicher Arbeiten," No. 43.)
Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1932. Pp. xx+373. Rm. 42.

A useful and promising work, this bibliography of journalism is the only one in its precise field. It is divided into two main groups: German and foreign; each of these into various smaller classes: publishing, editing, manufacturing, freedom of the press, the psychology of the newspaper and its influence on public opinion, its position in society, in economic and industrial life, as an advertising medium, etc. It is typically Teutonic in its thoroughness, in its philosophical exposition of the extent of ground covered and justification for the positions taken.

Faced by the difficulty of handling the mass of material at his command, the editor chose to set forth a selection rather than to aim at completeness. How wisely this decision has been carried out is a matter of individual judgment. The editor was presumably satisfied. But if selection was so important a matter, one may be pardoned a mild expression of wonder now and then at inclusion of such topics as paper-making and the paper industry, or unethical medical advertising in newspapers, or a study of wedding announcements and the "object matrimony" advertisements of the lovelorn. Of course they all touch the periodical and newspaper world. No doubt. But if you include them, why not discussions of the effect of conditioned air in securing better register in multicolor work?

The scope of the list is wide, almost cosmic, including articles on Shakespeare criticism in the *Gentleman's magazine* (a Königsberg dissertation, p. 185), on the essentials of literary criticism as set forth by Addison (p. 191, a Berlin dissertation), or Steele's criticism of Shakespeare in the *Tatler* and the *Spectator* (p. 192, Rostock dissertation). One would scarcely turn to a bibliography of journalism and the press for a study of Caxton as England's first printer and publisher. No doubt he was, but why include this German work and omit Blades and the other students of Caxton? Four editions of Junius dated between 1772 and 1804 are noted, but the only entry about Junius is a German study dated 1867.

Under "Internationales Zeitungswesen" one would certainly expect to find such things as Sell's *dictionary of the world's press*, Willing's *British and Irish press guide*, Mitchell's *Newspaper press directory*. They are primarily British, to be sure, but far from confined to the island. *Editor and publisher and Fourth estate international year book*, of New York, is likewise worthy of mention in the international section. *Annuaire de la presse française et étrangère*, in the opinion of some, far and away the most satisfactory international directory, is entered only under France. So too the *Check list of foreign newspapers in the Library of Congress*, compiled under the direction of Henry S. Parsons (Washington, 1929), deserves mention.

Editing, at any time and under any conditions, calls for rigorous selection. Was it editorial rejection, or oversight, that failed to include S. N. D. North's *History and present condition of the newspaper and periodical press of the United States*, issued in 1884 as part of the reports of the tenth census? And why does any record of American newspapers pass over that stimulating and revealing and memorable series of *Casual essays of the Sun*, published in 1905? Were Clarence Brigham's lists of American newspapers before 1820 omitted because they appeared in the publications of the American Antiquarian Society, or the useful supplements by Mr. Millington for Washington, D.C., papers (1820-50) and by Mr. Fox for New York City (1820-50) passed by because they are hidden in the *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*?

The *Union list of serials* is included, as well as the Faxon *Magazine subject index*, and Poole, and Cannons, and the British Library Association *Subject*

index to periodicals. Why mention these, however, and omit the *Readers' guide?* There is no doubt that the annual reports of the Associated Press belong in such a record. But why note only the twenty-second? How many have been issued, for how long, and what period does the series cover? Surely it is not unreasonable to expect an answer to such questions. The *Official index to the Times* began in 1906, not 1907. But why include it and say nothing about Palmer's *Index*, which covers the period from 1805 to date? The *New York times index* is entered for 1931, but no mention is made of the earlier (1860, 1863-1904, 1913-date) issues, or of the *New York tribune index* for 1875-1906.

Bonol's "Mr. Miller of the 'Times'" (p. 189) is a tribute to the New York editor, and belongs to the American rather than the London paper. Walter Page as editor of the *Atlantic monthly* and founder of *World's work* has a place in such a list, but most of us would be inclined to enter him under the United States when *A Publisher's confession* written by him was under discussion, even though the edition cited bears a London imprint (p. 191). Transplanting is not wholly an eastward movement, however. Stanley Morison issued in 1931 through the Cambridge University Press (England) a study of *Ichabod Dawks and his news-letter; with an account of the Dawks family of booksellers and stationers, 1635-1731*. This appears here (p. 288) as *Schabod Dawk and his, etc.*, entered among the records of individual American newspapers. Phillip Gibbs's *Adventures in journalism* is listed as a contribution to American newspaperdom and apparently is completely passed by as a story of life in Fleet Street. *Printing art* is recorded as a weekly, apparently still published. It always was a monthly and since 1925 has been swallowed up in *Printed salesmanship*. So too *Sell's world's press* is set down as current since 1884, though it ceased publication in 1921.

Omission is perhaps inevitable in the case of regional lists, but it seems unfortunate that Frank William Scott's *Newspapers and periodicals of Illinois, 1814-1879* (Springfield, 1910) or Ada Tyng Griswold's *Annotated catalogue of newspaper files in the library of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin* (Madison, 1911) should experience that fate. Is not the Rand School of Social Science *American labor press directory* worthy of notice? And why not the *World list of scientific periodicals, published in the years 1900-1921* (Oxford, 1925-27)? Or the *Annuaire générale de la presse belge* (1924), or *Index bibliographicus* (Berlin, 1931)?

There certainly is no reason why a list like this should not include the newspaper world as the novelists show it. *Sounding brass*, the story of Sir Charles Higham, the British advertising man, set forth as thinly disguised fiction, is noted. But if that, why not *Street of adventure* or *The New Grub Street* or *Blix* or *The Bread line* or *The Stolen story* or *Gallagher* or *A Modern instance*? Why fiction, but no drama? Chapter xv of Claire E. Ginsburg's *A Newspaperman's library* (University of Missouri bulletin, "Journalism series," No. 22) lists twenty-three titles as "fiction about journalists." As a matter of fact, this whole Ginsburg list seems to have been overlooked by Dr. Bömer.

Occasional misprints occur: *Wrin* at one time and *Wrinn* correctly at another, both for the same book: *Wright, Harward, Schnyler, Bodbian, fifty, Susic* (for *Susie*).

The last paragraph of the Introduction expresses the hope that this offering may serve as the basis for an extension, expansion, or revision. Might it not be well, when the second edition is issued, to submit the sections relating to countries outside Germany to students of the newspaper world in those countries or to assistants competent to give adequate supervision and proofreading?

HARRY M. LYDENBERG

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

William Watts Folwell: the autobiography and letters of a pioneer of culture. By WILLIAM WATTS FOLWELL. Edited by SOLON J. BUCK. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1933. Pp. 287. \$3.00.

The autobiography of Dr. Folwell appeared on the one-hundredth anniversary of his birth. It is true that the chief work of Dr. Folwell was in the field of education, as first president of the University of Minnesota, teacher, and organizer. Still, the fact that he held for more than thirty-seven years, 1869-1906, the title and position of librarian also, was in fact one of the pioneer librarians of the West, makes the appearance of the present volume an event of interest to American librarians, few of whom have so far left any record of their lives and professional work.

Dr. Folwell had not prepared for a library career. He served for many years as librarian without compensation and at no time received more than four hundred dollars a year for the two hours a day which he devoted to the library. Under the circumstances, and because teaching and university administration always had absorbed his chief interest and energy, he never assumed the position among the librarians of his generation held by a Windsor, Poole, Dewey, Billings, Cutter, Crunden, or Fletcher. The fact that he devotes only a few pages, 233-38, to his library career would also seem to indicate that he had himself regarded his contributions to librarianship as of little moment. In the brief references to his administration of the library, he mentions a few important purchases, the planning of a new building, and the adoption of a system of classification, that of Melvil Dewey. Among the assistants who no doubt performed such duties as devolved on the library staff at the time, he mentions particularly Miss Firkins, J. S. Clark, C. C. Campbell, Charlotte A. Rollit, and Letitia M. Crafts. Among these names that of Miss Firkins and Miss Crafts are best remembered by older librarians.

Incidentally, Dr. Folwell refers to a library course which he conducted for the benefit of his night attendants, all no doubt student assistants. That the courses were worth while is seen from the names of students who later entered the library profession, e.g., James I. Wyer, later the well-known director of the

New York State Library and Library School at Albany, president and secretary of the American Library Association, etc. The writer has a vivid recollection of Wyer as a first-year student in the New York Library School and attending the American Library Association Conference of 1898 at Chautauqua. The fluency and self-reliance with which he entered into discussions of technical problems at the general sessions indicated a grasp of library technique quite unusual in a first-year student, and owing no doubt in part to the advance training received under the supervision of Dr. Folwell. Other students mentioned are Malcolm Wyer, now librarian of the Denver Public Library, and Jacob Hodnefield, later with the Minnesota Historical Society and the James Jerome Hill Reference Library.

By 1906 the situation at Minnesota seemed to demand the appointment of a professionally trained librarian who could devote all his time to the library. The man selected was James T. Gerould, now librarian of Princeton University, and Dr. Folwell states: "He was by no one more cordially welcomed than by the old official in charge." Of much interest is the part of the autobiography which tells of the young student's experiences at various German universities, in Greece, Italy, and other European countries during the period just preceding the Civil War. In the course of studies and travels Dr. Folwell must have acquired linguistic accomplishments and a cultural background which should have made him an almost ideal librarian had he been trained for this profession and been in a position to make it his life-work. His stay in Europe was cut short by the breaking out of the Civil War. His participation in the war as an officer of engineers is shown to have been of no little importance. Many letters and reports are reproduced which throw light on the stirring events of this period.

The work is of considerable historical value. Many letters and documents have been included which will prove of importance to future students of education and history, especially of Minnesota and the Central West. Much of the credit for this we owe to the editor, Mr. Solon J. Buck, for a number of years superintendent of the Minnesota Historical Society and closely connected with Dr. Folwell during the later years of his life.

J. C. M. HANSON

GRADUATE LIBRARY SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Norvegica: 1. Januar 1883-1933: Minneskrift til Femti-Årsdagen for Oprettelsen av Universitets Bibliotekets Norske Avdeling. Av BIBLIOTEKETS TJENESTEMENN. Oslo: Grøndahl & Søns Bogtrykkeri, 1933.
Pp. 276.

It is difficult for an American librarian to become reconciled to the arrangement existing in national libraries of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, viz., of

two main divisions, one to hold the books printed or published in the country itself and the second to include all foreign books. In each division the books may be subdivided according to some system of classification. The defense presented by the chief librarian, Munthe, in the introductory article "Norske avdelings forhistorie" (historical sketch of the Norwegian division) for this arrangement, may or may not impress his colleagues outside of the three northern countries, where both librarians and users of libraries are evidently quite reconciled to it.

Munthe concedes that it is out of the question for a library in a country whose literature appears in one of the world-languages, e.g., English, French, or German, to attempt such division of its book resources, but he maintains that the separate shelving of the national book production in the national library of a small country is both practical and natural. It is the expression of a sound national consciousness. One does not wish to see the somewhat meager output of one's own country in a given branch of art or science completely submerged in the mighty ocean of the world's literature. There enters in also another consideration, the obligation of the national library to collect and preserve as complete a representation as possible of the literary output of the country, and a separation of the national literature from the foreign books is naturally a great aid to those on whom falls the duty of checking and collecting the printed material.

This idea of establishing as a separate collection the books published in or dealing with a given state, city, or other locality is not entirely foreign to American libraries. One readily recalls the effort of Colonel Reuben Durrett to bring together at Louisville all books written by Kentuckians, or relating to Kentucky. When the Library of Congress was reorganized in 1897, the plan of segregating all books published or printed in the District of Columbia, or relating to Washington, was seriously considered. The writer was among those who opposed it, on the ground that books relating to Washington and the District would be brought together by application of the classification then being drawn up; other books, aside from government publications, listed by the superintendent of documents in his catalogues, could be controlled as readily by the setting-aside of a copy of the catalogue card to be printed as by separate shelving, a plan which did not materialize for the reason that other special catalogues, e.g., books printed in America before 1800 and in western states before dates to be determined, seemed more important.

In general, the establishment of separate collections tending to weaken the value of a subject classification of books has been opposed by American librarians. In fact, it has become almost an accepted principle that no gift collection will be received to which there attaches the condition that it be kept intact. Special catalogues and bookplates may be provided, but not a special room, or separate location.

Munthe's article is a valuable contribution, not only in that it shows the origin and growth of the *Norvegica* division of the university library at Oslo,

but because of the light thrown on the rise and development of the practice of obligatory deposits of books published or printed in Norway. In this connection he covers Denmark and Sweden also, and in a table on pages 38-39 presents a survey of the laws now in force in European countries which relate to the same matter.

Other contributions are "Snorre's dramatic dialogues" by Hallvard Lie; "Manuscript newspapers," by Haakon Fiskaa; "History of the periodical *Samlinger til det norske folks sprog og historie*," by Margarethe Kjaer; "Ibsen and Snoilsky," by Harald L. Tvetenås; "Three applications for government aid and a report, from Jonas Lie," by H. S. Bakken; "Rallarvisen," by Hanna Lund; "Santalia-Norvegica," by Solveig Tunold; "Pater Hell's observations at Vardøhus, 1769," by H. B. Kragemo; "Book auctions in Christiana around 1700," by Leiv Amundsen; "The Transition from Gothic to Latin script in Norway," by Reidar Omang; "Bookbinders and binding of the university library," by Peter Kleppa.

It will be noted that the majority of articles are of literary rather than bibliographic or bibliothecal interest. The writers are all connected with the university library, and the contents of this valuable Jubilee publication throws an interesting sidelight on what may be expected from the staff of a European national library, even in so small a country as Norway. It would be difficult to draw a comparison here between an American and a European library. The average American librarian devotes to the direct service of his library practically all of his time and energy and cannot therefore be expected to write many books or articles. In Europe the situation is reported to be somewhat different. The fact remains, however, that the scholarly libraries of Europe have as yet a decided advantage in the matter of assistants with a thorough scholarly background, able therefore to prepare papers and original contributions such as we find in the present volume.

Of more than ordinary interest to librarians as well as to students of the history of writing and printing is the contribution of Omang on "The Transition from Gothic to Latin script." The struggle between the two systems continued in Norway through the middle and almost to the end of the nineteenth century. For a long series of years, schools were called on to teach gothic and roman writing side by side, to the confusion of both pupils and teachers. We are reminded in this connection of the fierce attacks made on the Library of Congress some thirty-three years ago, when it decided that inasmuch as its catalogue cards were to be printed in roman type, common names in German, Danish, and Dutch were to be printed with lower-case initial letters. Today there are probably few who would contend that the decision was a mistake. Furthermore, it would seem to be merely a matter of time before the few countries which still adhere to the old practice will get in line and adopt, at any rate roman script if not the type.

The publication ends with a list of those who have served on the staff of the

university library, 1813-1932, by Lizzie Prytz. A surprising number of names well known to the world of science, history, literature, bibliography, etc., are here represented.

J. C. M. HANSON

GRADUATE LIBRARY SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Philobiblon: Zeitschrift für Bücherliebhaber. Jahrgang VI, Heft 5, May, 1933. Vienna: Herbert Reichner Verlag, monthly. Annual subscription \$4.00.

It is not astonishing that the manager of *Philobiblon* can claim for his periodical that "no other monthly magazine for booklovers . . . has so many subscribers in all the five continents," for it is easily the most alert, the most interesting, and the most accurate periodical in its field.

Every persistent reader of magazines for bookmen comes to have a feeling that certain weaknesses and shortcomings are inevitable in this type of journalism. After a short period of initial enthusiasm the editorial standard seems always to sag, and one gets a picture of a small group of harassed individuals, goaded by the calendar, with tenuous material and overwhelming expenses, striving somehow, in time marginal to their regular work, to assemble an issue that will not be too bad to print. Whether this is the true state of affairs or not, the faults which suggest it are patent: the news-reporting is badly done, events of minor significance are given inordinate space while important ones are passed by without notice; the papers that are printed form an unbalanced intellectual diet; and for each one which inspires confidence in its scholarship there are too many others which do just the opposite.

But *Philobiblon*, now in its sixth year, has not yet dropped to this usual level. In part this may be because it is produced in Vienna where topsy-turvy conditions make important an enterprise which would inevitably be crowded aside in a more bustling setting. Be this as it may, indubitable factors of the magazine's success are the knowledge and the skill of its editing. The news-gathering organization is remarkable: nearly every issue reports American occurrences for which one will look in vain in American journals. The contributors' papers, almost without exception, deal with matters which, while they are detailed, have a general significance. The last number, for example, contains these studies: Dr. Diehl of Frankfort on Erhard Ratdolt; Professor Sudhoff of Leipzig, on the writings attributed to Basil Valentine; and Baron Hellmuth of Weimar, on the private library of Goethe. These obviously, while they are monographs, are also chapters in the general history of literary culture.

Another feature of merit in *Philobiblon* is the attention that is devoted to factual details; every note is precise, and the facsimile reproductions, in which

it is unusually generous, are always explicitly labeled. This makes a file, in one sense, a trustworthy source book.

Every librarian who is interested in bibliographical history will do well to examine this magazine regularly. If he reads German he will find valuable material; if he does not, he will discover how much he is missing and be inspired to acquire the language.

PIERCE BUTLER

GRADUATE LIBRARY SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Ancient writing and its influence. By B. L. ULLMAN. ("Our debt to Greece and Rome.") New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1932. Pp. 234. \$1.75.

Considering that writing is mankind's "most useful art" (Thomas Astle), it is surprising that so few satisfactory general histories of it have been published. This book should immediately take its place as the best account in English.

There is still use for the old classics such as Astle, Taylor, Berger, and Mason's more recent, though badly proportioned, *History of the art of writing* (New York, 1920), since the book under review is of narrower scope, as is to be inferred from the title of the series in which it appears, "Our debt to Greece and Rome." Professor Ullman does, however, devote his first short chapter to the "Origin of writing," which it now appears pretty certainly was in picture writing, whether we concern ourselves with Chinese in the Far East, Babylonian in the Near East, Aztec in the Far West, or, as this book does primarily, with Greek and Roman, from which the modern Occident inherits directly.

The "Origin of our alphabet" (chap. ii) is traced to a "proto-Semitic," as exemplified in the Sinaitic inscriptions discovered in 1905 but not recognized until 1916 as related on the one hand to Egyptian hieroglyphics and on the other hand to the Phoenician writing and so to the Greek, Roman, and our own.

As the discovery and decipherment of the Sinaitic inscriptions have pushed back the origin of the Semitic alphabet to probably 2000 B.C., so the recently discovered Ahiram inscription pushes back the origin of the Greek alphabet to probably the fourteenth century B.C., which is the date (so far as mythological characters can be dated) when Cadmus introduced "Phoenician" letters to the Greeks.

Why the Greeks invented vowel symbols, converting the Phoenician consonantal alphabet into what we consider a real alphabet, how these new symbols were invented, and why more of them were not invented are the chief content of chapter iii. The description of the local varieties of the Greek alphabet brings us to the Italic alphabets (chaps. iv and v). Here again appear new results from recent studies. The Roman alphabet seems to have come

from the Greek via an early Etruscan alphabet; the other Italic alphabets, from a later Etruscan.

The treatment of Greek and Roman writing (chaps. vi–xi) is more detailed, is accompanied by 16 plates containing 47 small but clear facsimiles, and constitutes the most correct and up-to-date treatment in English on Greek and Latin palaeography. The student of palaeography will, of course, still have to depend on Thompson's *Introduction to Greek and Latin palaeography* because of its greater detail, its 250 facsimiles; but Thompson was not fully up to date when it was published in 1910 and now certainly needs such corrections as can be indicated from this book.

Following chapters deal with the "Names of the letters," "Abbreviations and ligatures," "Numerals," "Writing materials and practices"; and the influence of ancient writing is traced into the period of the printed book and modern handwriting. There is a concluding chapter on "Our debt" and an Appendix containing notes and a brief, well-selected bibliography.

We should have liked to see a little more explanation of how the picture of an object came to be used as an arbitrary symbol for a sound (A. H. Gardner, "Nature and development of the Egyptian hieroglyphic writing," *Journal of Egyptian archeology*, II [1915], 61–75). A more unfortunate omission is that of any facsimiles of Greek cursive papyri to accompany the description in the text of the origin of the Greek minuscule; and a single facsimile of Roman cursive is hardly adequate to trace the development of the Latin minuscule. The reviewer believes it is a mistake to begin the history of Roman writing with the monumental square capitals rather than with the earlier inscriptions in what are sometimes called "primitive capitals," of which the square capitals represent only one line of development. In the description of a certain cursive form of *b* (p. 75) one should probably read three or three-and-a-half centuries instead of the "first four centuries."

The bibliography, though admirably selected for the student who uses this book as a beginner, includes perhaps more references than necessary on the Sinaiitic inscriptions—and some of them to works hardly intelligible except to Semitic scholars. As in all selective bibliographies, one cannot resist noting omissions: There are several chapters in the *Handbuch der Bibliothekswissenschaft* which should not have been missed; among older works at least Philippe Berger's *Histoire de l'écriture dans l'antiquité* (2d ed.; Paris, 1892) merited mention; just a few more works on special periods and special schools of Latin writing would have made the list truly comprehensive; and Franz Steffens' *Lateinische Paläographie* has appeared in a reprinted edition (Berlin, 1929).

With these slight qualifications the book deserves enthusiastic commendation. Professor Ullman is thoroughly at home in all his material. In fact, his own recent researches have included important contributions to the history of both Semitic and classical alphabets. American library science has not been able to give palaeography more than a distant recognition as a very

special interest in bibliographical studies. Now this brief, authoritative, and readable book should make it part of every librarian's training—if not in the required curriculum, where the reviewer would place it, then certainly as extra-curricular reading.

HENRY BARTLETT VAN HOESSEN

BROWN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

50 Jahre Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen. Erstes Heft des Jubiläumsjahrganges. 1933. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1933. Pp. 232.

For half a century, *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* has held a leading position among the library periodicals of the world. When it began to appear in 1884, librarianship in Germany, as in most other countries, was just beginning to gain recognition as a profession demanding a man's full time and strength, with a cultural background and professional preparation. Prior to 1870-80, it had been regarded in universities, at any rate, as a mere "Nebenamt" to which some professor might devote a few hours a week. In the change which has come about, *ZfB* has played a most important part, and in no country has it been more definitely established than in Germany, that, to fill important library positions, one must begin, as in other professions, at the bottom, not at the top.

Without exception, the editors of *ZfB* have been selected from among the leading librarians of Germany, men with not only a national but an international reputation. Otto Hartwig was the first, and he continued as editor for nineteen years, and was followed by Schwenke, Leyh, Bömer, and others, all men of the highest standing in the profession. A host of learned and capable collaborators have, during these fifty years, contributed to the columns of the journal and thus shared with the editors and publishers the credit for placing the profession on a firm basis. That there are still countries where administrators, politicians, trustees, and occasionally even college presidents regard the position of librarian as a convenient dumping ground for refuse from their faculties, poor dependents, and other incompetents who need to be taken care of, is probably due in some measure to the absence, in these countries, of an organ of communication such as the *ZfB*.

From the outset the editors have evidently had in mind certain definite aims and purposes. In addition to their support of librarianship as an independent profession, they have consistently urged collaboration and co-operation between libraries, on a national as well as an international basis—exchanges, interlibrary loans, studies of library architecture and equipment, cataloguing and classification problems, book selection, and, last but not least, history of libraries, of books and printing, with monthly and annual reviews and surveys of bibliographies, reference books, and other publications of special interest for the library profession.

Few of the early contributors are now in the land of the living. The writer recalls only one, Cardinal Franz Ehrle. Many librarians of other countries than Germany, particularly Austria, Switzerland, and the Scandinavian countries, have, from time to time, made valuable contributions. Of the contributors to the present Jubilee number, twelve are Germans, viz., Leyh, Krüss, Burdach, Milkau, Lehmann, Dold, Göber, Bömer, Littmann, Losch, Abb, Van der Briele. Switzerland is represented by Hermann Escher, France by Henri Lemaitre, America by W. W. Bishop, Sweden by Isak Collijn, Austria by Josef Bick, Norway by Wilhelm Munthe. Arundel Esdaile, editor of the *Library Association record*, sends congratulations.

As is to be expected in a publication of this character, articles are of varying merit. It is safe to say, however, that the great majority will provide valuable additions to the literature of the subjects treated. The last decade or two has witnessed a vast increase in the publications issued in honor of some individual, event, or institution. In some respects the multiplication of these volumes carries with it a problem for contributors as well as for librarians and bibliographers expected to furnish guides to each individual essay, whether from point of view of author or subject. As far as the contributors are concerned, there appears to be an uneven distribution of burdens. It is the leaders, *die Koryphäen*, in the profession or department of knowledge concerned, who are regularly called into action. Like speakers and singers frequently in demand, they cannot show to the best advantage at all times. To borrow an expression from the language of the sporting world, they cannot always be at the top of their form. As for librarians and bibliographers, already overwhelmed by the ever increasing avalanche of books, monographs, serials, and other publications pouring from our presses, these thousands of essays present additional problems pressing for a solution, as many of them are distinctly more valuable for the subject treated than are many of the books, monographs, and serial works published independently. Fortunately, indexes already in existence or planned may be expected to aid in the solution of some of these problems. Here, as in the case of books, monographs, and serials, it is in co-operation that we must seek relief.

The well-known firm, Otto Harrassowitz of Leipzig, has from the beginning published the *ZfB*. To Otto Harrassowitz much credit is due for the success of the periodical during the first quarter-century. Since his death, his son, Hans Harrassowitz, has followed in the footsteps of the father, and we have every assurance that the liberal policy which has done so much to insure the success of the periodical during its first fifty years will continue during the second half-century on which it is now about to enter.

J. C. M. HANSON

GRADUATE LIBRARY SCHOOL

The Secondary-school library. By B. LAMAR JOHNSON. ("National Survey of Secondary Education," Monograph No. 17.) Washington: U.S. Department of the Interior, Office of Education, 1933. Pp. vii+109. 10 cents.

During the last ten years the school library has received increasing attention from educators. As the newer methods in education have developed, the need for a well-organized, well-equipped school library has become evident. That the school library is recognized as an integral part of secondary-school organization is evidenced by the inclusion of a monograph on the subject in the National Survey of Secondary Education, sponsored by the Office of Education, Washington, D.C. This study, entitled *Secondary-school library*, by Dr. B. Lamar Johnson, is the most comprehensive survey yet made of school libraries.

The data upon which the study is based were gathered from inquiry forms sent throughout the country to 620 schools recommended by experts as having outstanding libraries. Returns of inquiry forms were received from 390 schools in 46 states and the District of Columbia. These schools varied widely in enrolment. From a study of the returned forms 44 schools in 15 states were selected for a personal visit by Dr. Johnson in order that he might observe outstanding school libraries representative of the better practices in schools with various types of school-library organization and administration. Conferences were held with the librarian, principal, and teachers in the schools visited, and in 24 schools pupils were given checklists to indicate the activities engaged in during school-library periods. It is evident from a brief summary of the methods of investigation that the study is comprehensive and scientific. The purposes of the survey are primarily to list and describe activities and devices used in outstanding secondary-school libraries and to present data regarding the administration, staff, and facilities of these libraries. Certain problems of secondary-school libraries are also interpreted, and further investigations of problems relating to the secondary-school library are proposed. Not only, then, does this study present a statistical summary of the situation in the secondary-school libraries included in the study, but it also points out and describes innovations in these different libraries.

The inclusiveness of the study is evident when we note the headings of the chapters—"Functions of the library," "Facilities of the library," "Librarians and pupil assistants," "Use of the library by pupils," "Library and the new methods of classroom teaching," "Teachers and the library," "Activities and devices," "The Library in the small high school," "Co-operation with other libraries," and "Summary and unsolved problems." The figures and tables which are used profusely throughout the survey are well arranged and illustrate clearly the points made on each subject.

After a careful analysis of the rooms, equipment, and book collections, Dr. Johnson gives some illuminating data on the duties and training of librarians.

In many schools, particularly small high schools, the librarian has a full teaching program, so can give only a limited amount of time and energy to library duties, while in other schools, some of which are small, one or often two librarians devote their full time to giving library service to students and teachers. A study of the training of librarians makes it evident that many teachers with little or no library training are acting as librarians in high schools.

The use of the library by pupils is given a prominent place in the report. The relation of the library to the study hall is discussed in a very competent manner. The reports of 17,463 pupils in 24 schools show that requiring the pupils to spend vacant periods in the library encourages the use of library materials. Library instruction for students, data on circulation and attendance, and the use of library materials by students are included. The problem of the teachers and the library is handled in a complete and masterly fashion. Both librarians and teachers will find many helpful suggestions from reading the activities which teachers use to encourage the use of the library as well as activities on the part of teachers which discourage the use of the library. Likewise, helpful activities of librarians as reported by teachers are mentioned. One chapter is devoted to the library in the small high school with suggestions for improving service, while another chapter takes up the co-operation with other libraries, such as the public library and state library. The last chapter is a summary of the investigation and suggests problems for further study.

It is remarkable how Dr. Johnson has condensed the outstanding problems of the secondary-school library in a pamphlet of 110 pages. The achievements of the school library to date have been carefully appraised and the problems still to be solved are indicated. From this study, carried out on a national scale and imbued with an understanding of both the school and the library point of view, every librarian, teacher, and principal can gain insight into the school-library movement and can secure suggestions for improving school-library service.

DOROTHA DAWSON

DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Samuel L. Clemens; first editions and values. By JOHN K. POTTER.
Chicago: Black Archer Press, 1932. Pp. iii+80. \$5.00.

In the modest introductory note to Mr. Potter's short bibliography of Mark Twain the author claims to present in a concise and practical form the essential characteristics of the first editions of the famous humorist. He assures us that he does not attempt to include more than the separately printed contributions and he does not presume to claim "absolute completeness" in regard to the points existing in the first editions. Armed with these two admissions, the reader is somewhat reluctant to place his confidence in the eighty-page booklet, especially if he is at all aware of the bibliographical work that already has been done on Mark Twain. In 1910 Merle Johnson published

an admirable work on Clemens, and in recent months I. S. Underhill and George H. Brownell have added materially to the maze of points on the first published books and articles. Mr. Potter ignores these authorities in his Preface.

The main body of the work consists of some eighty entries very briefly described and with approximate values, an arrangement which bookmen agree is precarious. It is not apparent where the value of the list lies. With American literary bibliography so imperfectly covered, it would seem to be more profitable for the author to have chosen some other subject for his labors. A bibliography of Bret Harte, for instance, however short and however incomplete (and these adjectives are not becoming to a bibliography), would be more appreciated, at least by the librarian, than the present one.

GERTRUDE LOOP WOODWARD

NEWBERRY LIBRARY

An Elementary manual of dental library practice. By INEZ BOWLER.
("University of Michigan General Library Publications." No. 3).
Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1932. Pp. vi+181.
\$1.50.

This volume, according to the Preface written by Dr. W. W. Bishop, librarian of the University of Michigan and chairman of the College Library Advisory Board of the Carnegie Corporation, was prepared as part of a plan of the Carnegie Corporation to "demonstrate the value of a well selected library administered by professionally trained librarians." The University of Michigan was incidentally the fortunate recipient of a fund supplied by the corporation to "improve and strengthen its dental library." A model dental library was developed under the librarianship of Miss Inez Bowler, the author of this book, and formerly the librarian of the school of forestry of the University of Michigan. The manual, however, is intended for the guidance of untrained dental librarians. It may seem to the reader contradictory to good judgment to prepare a manual for the untrained librarian while one of the chief aims of the Carnegie project is to manifest the significance and value of a trained librarian. Libraries, however, cannot be developed overnight or funds found at once to provide for all the advancement that the committee is endeavoring to demonstrate. The trained dental librarian of the future will heartily thank the Carnegie Corporation for its forethought in publishing a manual of library-school methods for her untrained predecessor, providing, of course, that the latter will have made good use of it.

As early as 1910 the Carnegie Corporation made an investigation of medical education following which study considerable progress was made in the quality of medical schools, facilities for medical education, and preliminary training for the medical profession. Among other findings the importance of the

teeth to general health was duly recognized. In an effort, then, to do for dental education what had been accomplished in the field of medical education Dr. William J. Gies issued for the Carnegie Corporation in 1926 a report of dental education in the United States and Canada. At that time Dr. Gies found that one of the weak spots in dental schools was the absence of proper library facilities and a lack of understanding on the part of the school administrators that the librarian should have sufficient training to assist in all scientific investigation as well as to make the library an orderly and pleasant center of academic study. Upon this discovery the Carnegie Corporation again came to the rescue and provided the funds for the demonstration referred to in the Preface of this book.

The reason for the belated recognition of dentistry as a science is explained in a paragraph in Miss Bowler's Introduction: "During the early days of dentistry when the apprenticeship system was in vogue, progress was slow, because new developments were considered trade secrets to be revealed only to those who paid for the privilege of learning them. . . . As dentistry has developed from a trade to a profession, conditions have wholly changed." In closing the Introduction the author comments upon the value of the library "in aiding the profession of dentistry to develop into an important branch of health service."

Chapter ii is entitled "Quarters," and offers suggestions as to situation, size, workroom, lighting, shelving, furniture, and floor-covering for new libraries. The ensuing chapter contains valuable information on the intricacies of book-buying and methods of accessioning. In a chapter on classification, the two principal systems, the Dewey decimal and that of the Library of Congress, are set forth. The assertion is made, however, that the one generally used in the independent dental library is Dr. Arthur D. Black's classification of dental literature which is a modification of the Dewey system. A criticism of this system is offered on page 21, that "the chief defect of Black's classification, which it has in common with other systems, is that parts of the same subject are unduly separated. For example, dental anatomy is placed with dental books and thereby separated from anatomy in general." I do not agree that this is a defect. If we were to group together both oral and general books on anatomy, histology, physiology, pathology, surgery, and hygiene, there would be but few purely dental subjects left to classify. Is it a handicap in a general library that English poetry and French poetry are not together on the shelves because it is all poetry?

The author throughout the book uses Dewey's and Black's classification numbers for books suggested for purchase (a list, 84 pages long) as well as on all sample catalogue cards, periodical index cards, etc., and yet Dr. Bishop states in the Preface that the University of Michigan dental library is classified on the Library of Congress system. Whether this is a misstatement, or

whether Miss Bowler was obliged to reclassify all books mentioned in the manual, would be interesting to know.

Following the discourse on classification are chapters on cataloguing, circulation, and statistics, all information well organized, simply explained, and in keeping with library-school methods. The appendixes will be a boon to either the trained or the untrained librarian. Appendix I lists periodicals essential to the small library, while Appendix II is the list of books suggested for purchase, alluded to in a foregoing paragraph. Miss Bowler explains that the list of books is meant to be suggestive only, and that members of the faculty may prefer other titles to those listed. While this is true of some of the textbooks listed, any dental library having, as a nucleus, the books recorded here would indeed have a fine foundation upon which to build an excellent dental collection. Appendix III is a contribution which will make the book ever valuable as ready reference to the cataloguers of dental libraries. It is a list of subject headings for a dental-library catalogue. Fortunate will be the librarian whose catalogue can be started with these subject headings. Appendix IV lists supplies needed, and dealers in library supplies and furniture. An Index of eight pages completes the book.

In the opinion of the writer, the dental librarian would profit by some instruction in methods of publicity of the library resources, i.e., the placing of a bulletin board and display rack in a conspicuous place for calling attention to scholarly Masters' theses, original articles in recent journals written by members of the faculty, or for displaying the covers of new books, especially those not on the required reading lists but of scientific or philosophical interest to the student or doctor. Such lures will frequently stimulate the younger student to a wider acquaintance with the library and the material on which his scholarship depends. To quote from a recent survey entitled *The Liberal arts college*, "It is part of the responsibility of every librarian to 'sell' the use of the library to students, to show them its resources, and the ways in which it can contribute, not only to the furtherance of their formal education, but also to their pleasure. The ingenious librarian can devise many effective plans to these ends."

A few suggestions as to books and articles on the history of dentistry and dental literature would be valuable here, especially to the librarian who finds herself in charge of a dental library with little knowledge of the background of dentistry and its literature. Undoubtedly the author of this book and librarian of the model library, uprooted as she was from another type of library to be transplanted to the dental school, was obliged to feel her way carefully in the dental field. The sources she used in attaining a knowledge of dental literature in so short a period of time would be of great benefit to another in her position.

The manual as it stands, however, will always be invaluable to all dental librarians. The Carnegie Corporation should be highly commended for their

choice of a librarian who possesses not only the professional qualifications for building up a model library but the ability to express herself with clarity in writing down her observations for the benefit of others.

MADELENE MARSHALL

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY DENTAL SCHOOL

Sociology and education: An analysis of the theories of Spencer and Ward. By ELSA PEVERLY KIMBALL. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Pp. 323. \$4.50.

There are books that set straight in the author's mind what other educated people have straight or find little reason to bother about; there are books that straighten things out for a great many people along with the author; and then there are books that publicize new discoveries so that later others must needs orient them with reference to received knowledge and straighten out thought regarding them. This book is primarily of the first class mentioned. There are three aspects of the problem treated by the author: the articulation of Herbert Spencer's doctrine of education and his general philosophy; the similar treatment of Lester Ward's educational and sociological views; and the interrelation of these two composites by way both of comparison and contrast. The latter calls more for contrast, however, than comparison; and in its outworking reveals the articulation of the two systems taken separately.

Spencer preoccupied himself more with the static aspects of society and regarded education as a stream of individual acculturization seeping back to the social matrix imperceptively through the inheritance of acquired characteristics and otherwise. Ward, sensitive to the dynamic, conceived social evolution as transpiring intentionally through the individual and education as the instrument of progress. For life and learning, the author concludes, the passive preoccupation in the one and the dynamic emphasis in the other had best not be regarded as pure contrast, but as supplementary, "since one aims to accomplish with least friction an inevitable adaptation of man to various phases of the environment, while the other would adapt the environment to man wherever possible."

The book might just as well have been half the size, but for its being a doctoral dissertation; and it might better have been bound in paper and sold for one-fourth its present price, but for a general indisposition visibly to distinguish books of permanent from those of only temporary significance.

T. V. SMITH

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The following publications have been received at the offices of the *Library quarterly*:

- Accademie e Biblioteche d'Italia. Annali della direzione generale delle Accademie e Biblioteche a cura del ministero della E.N.* Vol. VI, No. 2. Rome: Biblioteca d'Arte Editrice, October, 1932. Pp. 100-200.
- Aesthetic measure.* By GEORGE D. BIRKHOFF. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933. Pp. xiii+226. \$7.50.
- American book-prices current. A record of books, manuscripts and autographs sold in the principal auction rooms of the United States during the season 1931-1932; June 1, 1931, to June 1, 1932.* Compiled from the auction catalogues and edited by MARY HOUSTON WARREN. New York: Bowker, 1933. Pp. xv+637.
- Annual bibliography of English language and literature.* Vol. XII, 1931. Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by MARY S. SERJEANTSON. Assisted by LESLIE N. BROUGHTON. Cambridge: Bowes & Bowes, 1932. Pp. 272. 7s. 6d.
- A Bibliography of English literature and history. With a syllabus for a co-ordinated course.* Prepared by J. BARTLET BREBNER and EMERY NEFF. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Pp. 19. 25 cents.
- Booklist books, 1932. A selection.* Chicago: American Library Association, 1933. Pp. 60. 65 cents.
- Bücherei und Bildungspflege. Zeitschrift für die gesamten auszerschulmässigen Bildungsmittel der Blätter für Volksbibliotheken.* Vol. XII, Part II. Stettin: Ackermann, 1932. Yearly subscription, Rm. 10.-.
- A Check list of fifteenth century books in the Newberry Library and in other libraries of Chicago.* Compiled by PIERCE BUTLER. Chicago: Newberry Library, 1933. Pp. xxiv+362.
- Child of the sea.* By ELIZABETH SYLE MADISON. ("California romance tales.") San Francisco: Suttonhouse, 1932. Pp. 30.
- Circulation work in college and university libraries.* By CHARLES HARVEY BROWN and H. G. BOUSFIELD. Chicago: American Library Association, 1933. Pp. 179. \$2.25.
- Citizens' organizations and the civic training of youth.* By BESSIE LOUISE PIERCE. ("Report of the Commission on the Social Studies," Part III. American Historical Association.) New York: Scribner's, 1933. Pp. xvii+428. \$2.00.
- Conflicts of principle.* By ABBOTT LAWRENCE LOWELL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932. Pp. 161. \$1.50.
- Danzig-Polen-Korridor und Grenzgebiete. Eine Bibliographie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Politik und Wirtschaft 1931 und 1932.* Edited by FRITZ PRINZHORN. Danzig: Bibliothek der Technischen Hochschule, July and October, 1932, and January, 1933. Pp. 284

- Dialect notes.* Vol. VI, Part V. ("Publications of the American Dialect Society.") New Haven: American Dialect Society, 1932. Pp. 281-312.
- Die Soviet-Union, 1917-1932. Systematische, mit Kommentaren versehene Bibliographie der 1917-1932 in deutscher Sprache ausserhalb der Soviet-Union veröffentlichten 1900 wichtigsten Bücher und Aufsätze über den Bolschewismus und die Soviet-Union.* Prepared by KLAUS MEHNERT et al. for the Deutsche Gesellschaft zum Studium Osteuropas. Berlin: Ost-Europa-Verlag, 1933. Pp. 186. Rm. 4.-.
- Documents on international affairs 1931.* Edited by JOHN W. WHEELER-BENNETT. Assisted by STEPHAN A. HEALD. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. 241. \$4.00.
- Educational broadcasting. A bibliography.* By ROBERT LINGLE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932. Pp. 162. \$1.50.
- English burlesque poetry, 1700-1750.* By RICHARD P. BOND. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932. Pp. 483. \$3.50.
- Fifth annual report, July 1, 1931-June 30, 1932.* ("Huntington Library publications.") San Marino, Cal.: Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, 1933. Pp. 33.
- The Gold star list of American stories, 1821-1933.* Syracuse, N.Y.: Public Library, 1933. Pp. 32. 25 cents.
- Gutenberg and the Book of Books. With bibliographical notes, reproductions of specimen pages and a listing of known copies.* By HENRY LEWIS JOHNSON. New York: Rudge, 1932.
- Historiography of America, 1600-1800, as represented in the publications of Columbia University Press.* By RICHARD B. MORRIS. New York: Columbia University Press, 1933. Pp. 30.
- Imprimatur. Ein Jahrbuch für Bücherfreunde.* Vol. III, 1932. Hamburg: Gesellschaft der Bücherfreunde zu Hamburg, 1932. Pp. 200.
- International intellectual co-operation 1932.* Paris: League of Nations Institute of Intellectual Co-operation, 1933; Boston: World Peace Foundation. Pp. 147. 50 cents.
- The League year-book 1932. First annual edition (corrected to July 15, 1932).* Edited by JUDITH JACKSON and STEPHEN KING-HALL. New York: Macmillan, 1932. Pp. xiv+590. \$3.50.
- Libraries in Canada. A study of library conditions and needs.* By the COMMISSION OF ENQUIRY, JOHN RIDINGTON, Chairman, et al. Toronto: Ryerson Press; Chicago: American Library Association, 1933. Pp. 153.
- The Literary life of the early Friends, 1650-1725.* By LUILLA M. WRIGHT. With an introduction by RUFUS M. JONES. ("Columbia University studies in English and comparative literature.") New York: Columbia University Press, 1932. Pp. xiv+309. \$3.00.

- Manuel pratique du bibliothécaire.* By Léo CROZET. Preface by POL NEVEUX and CHARLES SCHMIDT. ("Association des Bibliothécaires Français.") Paris: Emile Nourry, 1932. Pp. 279.
- Mary of Nimmegen. A facsimile of the copy of the English version in the Huntington Library.* With an introduction by HARRY MORGAN AYRES and ADRIAAN JACOB BARNOUW. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932. Pp. 46. \$2.50.
- The Museum and the community with a chapter on the library and the community. A study of social laws and consequences.* By PAUL MARSHALL REA. Lancaster, Pa.: Science Press, 1932. Pp. xv+259.
- The Oxford companion to English literature.* Compiled and edited by SIR PAUL HARVEY. New York: Oxford University Press, 1932. Pp. 866. \$4.50.
- The Printing of the first folio of Shakespeare.* By EDWIN ELLIOTT WILLOUGHBY. ("Supplement to the Bibliographical Society's transactions," No. 8.) Oxford: University Press, 1932. Pp. xiii+70.
- Report on the hours, salaries, training and conditions of service in British municipal libraries, 1931.* Edited by F. SEYMOUR SMITH.
- Social work year book 1933. A description of organized activities in social work and in related fields.* Edited by FRED S. HALL. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1933. Pp. 680. \$4.00.
- Subject headings used in the dictionary of the Library of Congress. Second cumulative supplement to the third edition including all additions from January, 1928, to December, 1932.* Washington: Library of Congress, 1933. Pp. 72. 35 cents.

